DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 275 UD 026 868

TITLE	Reauthorization of Expiring Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Programs. Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act. Volume 3. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, One Hundredth Congress, First Session on H.R. 5.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	19 Mar 87
NOTE	74p.; Serial No. 100-4. For related documents, see UD 026 826 and UD 026 867.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Block Grants; Case Studies; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; Hearings; *Program Effectiveness; School Effectiveness; *Supplementary Education; Urban Areas; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 100th; *Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 2; *Effective Schools Projects; Florida (Orange County); Reauthorization Legislation

ABSTRACT

This document reports on the third of a series of hearings on the reauthorization of expiring federal elementary and secondary education programs. Four school administrators gave testimony regarding the block grant programs funded under the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, Chapter 2. Testimony suggested the following: (1) the proposed audit reforms are laudatory but the provision of "technical assistance" requires further definition; (2) a specific percentage of Chapter 2 funds should be designated for implementation of the principles of "Effective Schools"; (3) a national study on Chapter 2 programs found that Chapter 2 funds are widely but unevenly distributed and are used by most schools for computer applications, about two-thirds of eligible private schools use Chapter 2 funds, and parents are not actively involved in decisions regarding Chapter 2 funds; and (4) the Orange County (Florida) Public Schools are a case study in the effectiveness of Chapter 2 programs. Seven supplementary prepared statements are appended. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

6/9/87

REAUTHORIZATION OF EXPIRING FEDERAL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act

Volume 3

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDREDTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 5

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, MARCH 13, 1987

Serial No. 100-4

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REAUTHORIZATION OF EXPIRING FEDERAL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act

Volume 3

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDREDTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 5

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, MARCH 19, 1987

Serial No. 100-4

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
75-040 WASHINGTON : 1987

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

3

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
ROBERT E. WISE, Jr., West Virginia
TIMOTHY J. PENNY, Minnesota
BILL RICHARDSON, New Mexico
TOMMY F. ROBINSON, Arkansas
PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
CHESTER G. ATKINS, Massachusetts
JAMES JONTZ, Indiana

JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
FRED GRANDY, Iowa
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
ROBERT E. WISE, Jr., West Virginia
BILL RICHARDSON, New Mexico
TOMMY F. ROBINSON, Arkansas
PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
CHESTER G. ATKINS, Massachusetts

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
FRED GRANDY, Iowa
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
(Ex Officio)

CONTENTS

Page

Hearing held in Washington, DC, on March 19, 1987 1

Statement of:

- Atwood, Ron, senior administrator for project development, Orange County Public Schools, Orlando, FL 33
- Terrell, Dr. Ray, dean, School of Education, California State University at Los Angeles 13
- Tirozzi, Gerald N., commissioner of education, Connecticut Department of Education, representing Council of Chief State School Officers 4
- Turnbull, Dr. Brenda, principal associate, Policy Studies Associates 23

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera:

- Atwood, Ron, senior administrator, project development services, Orange County Public Schools, Orlando, FL, prepared statement of 35
- Bennett, Maybelle Taylor, director of research, Coalition on Human Needs, statement of 56
- Richardson, Mrs. Elliot, Reading is Fundamental, Inc., statement of 64
- Terrell, Dr. Raymond D., dean, School of Education, California State University, prepared statement of 15
- Tirozzi, Gerald, commissioner of education, State of Connecticut, prepared statement of 10
- Turnbull, Dr. Brenda J., principal associate, Policy Studies Associates, prepared statement of 26
- Very Special Arts, statement of 66

REAUTHORIZATION OF EXPIRING FEDERAL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act

(Volume 3)

THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 1987

House of Representatives,
Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary
and Vocational Education,
Committee on Education and Labor,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m., in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Augustus F. Hawkins (chairman) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Hawkins, Biaggi, Hayes, Sawyer, Solarz, Richardson, Visclosky, Wise, Goodling, Bartlett, Fawell, Grandy, Gunderson and Petri.

Staff present: John Jennings, counsel; Nancy Kober, legislative specialist; Beverly Griffin, staff assistant; Barbara Dandridge and Andrew Hartman, legislative associate.

Chairman Hawkins. The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education is called to order.

As part of our efforts to review all the expiring elementary and secondary education programs, the subcommittee is holding a hearing today on Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, the education block grant program. Now that the block grant has been in operation several years, we are anxious to hear how it is working at the state and local level and whether any changes are needed.

Congressman Goodling will soon introduce a bill, which I will cosponsor, to reauthorize and improve Chapter 2. I am pleased to note that in the revising of the list of allowable activities to ensure they are focused on program improvement and educational quality, the bill focuses a portion of the state money on developing effective schools programs and also makes effective schools an allowable use of local money.

We are very pleased today to have a panel which consists of the witnesses who are now seated at the witness table, Mr. Gerald Tirozzi, Commissioner of Education, Connecticut Department of Education—he is also representing Council of Chief State School Officers; Dr. Ray Terrell, Dean, the School of Education, California State University at Los Angeles; Dr. Brenda Turnbull, Principal Associate, Policy Studies Associates; Ron Atwood, Senior Administrator for Project Development, the Orange County Public Schools, Orlando, Florida.

May I welcome the witnesses who are before us today.

And Mr. Goodling, do you care to make a statement?

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am pleased we have the opportunity to hear testimony today on Chapter 2. As you know, this law was enacted in 1981 as part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act. As the result of this legislation, over 30 separate categorical programs were combined into a single education block grant.

First there were some who felt that this was not a good change, that we were better off with the array of small programs. But six years later, Chapter 2 has won the support of parents, teachers, administrators, and other persons involved in the educational enterprise.

I believe the reason for the success of the program is flexibility. In hearings across the country, my colleagues and I have heard a great deal of praise for Chapter 2, and a unanimous request to retain its flexibility. Whether through mini-grants to teachers, programs for gifted and talented, counselling services, or effective schools efforts, Chapter 2 has improved the education of millions of youngsters.

State departments of education have also found the funding they receive from Chapter 2 is invaluable in providing assistance to local education agencies. The next few days I will be joined by Chairman Hawkins in introducing a bill to reauthorize Chapter 2 through 1993.

While I believe we will be making some important and positive changes in the reauthorization proposal, the goal has been to retain the discretion at the local level to the greatest extent possible.

I look forward to your testimony. I am going to have to get that from Andy, because at the present time the Budget Committee is beginning their markup, and that is over in the Cannon Building, and it is a little difficult for me to stretch my body so part of it is here and part of it is there, but I think the budget process is going to be very important.

I was just showing the Chairman what would happen if, you freeze, just freeze the budget. I pointed out to the President a freeze at the outlay levels of this year would mean a 23 percent cut in compensatory education. So freeze is not—is a great word to use, but it does not really mean what most people think it means. It really means cuts.

So I think I am going to have to leave and go over to the Budget Committee and rely on Andy to make sure that the most important things you say are things that I will hear. I have an idea, having read part of your testimony, what that is going to be.

Thank you very much for coming to testify.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Goodling. We certainly depend upon you and Mr. Williams, members of this committee, to defend us before the Budget Committee. So we certainly understand your mission today, and we—you have our staunch and best wishes.

Mr. GOODLING. And prayers.

Chairman HAWKINS. And prayers, yes.

Any other—Mr. Biaggi?

Mr. BIAGGI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to commend you, first, for your leadership with respect to the reauthorization of the Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 programs, and many other critical education programs that will be considered in the near future.

The Chapter 2 program has been the object of considerable debate since its inception in 1981. The members of this committee did not have an opportunity to draft this measure, nor did we have the chance to vote on the proposal here in committee. It was drafted and included in the Omnibus Reconciliation Act, a measure that passed in order to keep our government running smoothly.

As a result, I look forward with great interest to our consideration of this program, and am confident we can improve on this block grant approach to education.

In my home district of New York City, where we received over $13 million in Chapter 2 funds, my people in New York tell me they love the flexibility Chapter 2 provides, so they may best address their education needs at the local level. While I recognize their support and the support of many local districts around the country for this program, I believe we can improve Chapter 2, and look forward to the opportunity to do so here in this committee.

Of course, I could not let this opportunity pass without commenting on an education program of great importance to me, gifted and talented education. This special education program was folded into the Chapter 2 block grant back in 1981, and as a result, we have witnessed acute educational neglect in this area. I intend to continue my efforts with respect to H.R. 543, a bill I authored to provide federal assistance in the area of gifted and talented education. Our nation must do everything possible to see that these students reach their full potential. We, as a nation, desperately need the contributions these young folks can give us.

I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Goodling, for the leadership you have provided to this subcommittee, and I pledge to work with you to ensure that all our nation's students receive effective and more appropriate educational services.

Thank you.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you.

Mr. Wise.

Mr. Visclosky.

If not, then we will proceed with the panel. The first witness is Mr. Gerald Tirozzi.

Mr. Tirozzi, we welcome you and look forward to your testimony.

May I indicate to the witnesses that their prepared statements in their entirety will be entered in the record at this point, and the committee obviously would appreciate the witnesses giving us the highlights of their statement, and then leaving time for us to discuss their statements, question them, and so forth, at the end of the hearing after we have heard from all the witnesses.

Mr. Tirozzi, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF GERALD N. TIROZZI, COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, REPRESENTING COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

Mr. TIROZZI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am Gerald Tirozzi, Commissioner of Education in the State of Connecticut, and I am honored to have the opportunity to speak to you today on behalf of the Council of Chief State School Officers regarding the reauthorization of federal programs for our nation's elementary and secondary school children.

While this hearing is specifically designated for Chapter 2, I am very much aware of your constrained hearing schedule, and today I would like to offer my remarks, and the remarks of the chiefs, as related to Chapter 1 and Chapter 2, as well as the strong role which I feel the states must play as we look to the important aspect of reauthorization.

I remind you that the Chief State School Officers is a professional organization composed of the commissioners and superintendents of education from each of the 50 states, the extraterritorial jurisdictions, and the District of Columbia. We serve basically as the principal administrators of the public school systems in our state, and our major role, of course, is to implement federal and state policy and programs for our nation's youngsters.

In terms of my testimony, and to give you a sense of my own background, and hopefully, add some credibility, further credibility, to my statements, you should know that I have served as superintendent of an urban school district in Connecticut, New Haven, and that right now is considered the seventh poorest city in the United States, cities of 100,000 or more, a city which has approximately—has an enrollment of approximately 80 percent minority and about 80 percent of the youngsters are on some form of AFDC. And I served in that function for six years, and basically my entire background is in urban education.

I also serve as chairperson of the chiefs equity committee, and I think it is important that you understand that this particular year, in looking at reauthorization, the chiefs made a conscious decision to have the equity committee and the legislative committee work together, because we are talking about issues that, of course, are not mutually exclusive, and if you look at Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 and the reauthorization, you are looking at significant equity issues and questions.

The chiefs, in looking at reauthorization, have spent the better part of a year in developing positions and principles, and probably most significantly has been our work since January 1 of this year. We made a decision, and I think it was an excellent decision, to begin to work closely with the various child advocacy groups in the country to get a better sense as to major goals, major expectations, and concerns. And this series of historic meetings from January through now has really given the chiefs an opportunity to get a—gain a much better understanding of where the child advocacy groups are coming from, what their positions are.

And it is very important to note, and during my presentation I hope I can highlight, the fact that on a number of principles we are in full agreement. You should also know that we had excellent success with the nonpublic schools, the Catholic Conference in particular, and we also shared views, we also shared common concerns, and I think through those meetings we did reach some very good conclusions that I will, in a few moments, present to you.

I give you this background because I want you to give it—have a real sense as to how serious the Council of Chief State School Officers has taken their responsibility, and the fact that we have reached out and tried to work very cooperatively with a number of other groups and organizations which impact on the lives of children.

I present to you several principles for your consideration in Chapter 1, some of which are in the present bill, some of which should be considered. First and foremost, of course, we hope that ultimately Chapter 1 services can be extended to all eligible children. Presently in this country it appears that we are serving somewhere in the neighborhood of 35 to 40 percent of those children who are in fact eligible. So we have a long way to go.

Having offered that as a principle, and being a realist, I know you share my view that we cannot expect Congress in the foreseeable future to make a decision to fund, nor could we probably afford to fund all of the eligible students, but it has to be in front of us at all times as a goal.

A second principle, taking into consideration the fact that we cannot secure full funding in the immediate future, we must make a concentrated effort to target services to the students with the greatest need. That has to be a major underlying principle, and in particular, we have to look very carefully at concentration grants, driving dollars to those communities where they have a high concentration of youngsters who are not achieving and who live in the cycle of poverty.

Another principle we would like to offer relates to the state incentive grant programs. We would hope, in the reauthorization of Chapter 1, that funds can be provided, incentive funds, to allow individual states to develop their own programs in compensatory education which can support, parallel, those efforts which are being exerted through Chapter 1 funding. In order to do this, the reauthorization must take into consideration needed funding if in fact we are going to talk about incentives. We must also talk about the removal of statutory barriers to efficient coordination of these services with Chapter 1.

In many of our states we have outstanding programs in place; in other states we still have a long way to go, and the concept of incentive grants could move us in that direction.

A principle that the chiefs strongly support, and I personally very strongly support, relates to school-based programs and projects. The research is replete with references to the school being the unit of analysis, the school being the critical attack point, the school as the unit where we can have the greatest reward. And most of us are aware of the excellent work done by Ron Edmonds, and the characteristics of instructionally effective schools. That must be a major consideration in order to ensure in the reauthorization that that can become a reality.

What I would suggest, the chiefs suggest, that we carefully review the 75 percent requirement of students enrolled being from low-income families. The problem—and I was very interested to hear Phil Runkle, the chief from Michigan, make this statement last week to the advocacy groups—at 75 percent, no school in Detroit, Michigan, is eligible to participate in the school-based programs under Chapter 1, and that has to be considered.

We are not in a position this morning to represent a particular percentage, but I would suggest, of course, it has to be less than 75, and a number of groups and organizations have to carefully consider this and reach a more reasonable figure.

We also have to ensure that in the reauthorization, if we want to support school-based programs, we have to remove the local match requirements. This is a significant issue. If you want school-based projects and you want those projects in schools with high concentrations of poor youngsters, these are generally the communities that can least afford to match, and that has to be taken into consideration if we are all serious about moving in this direction.

Another principle, the chiefs want to ensure that all children are eligible, and in particular we recommend that language be incorporated to allow for youngsters who meet the Chapter 1 criteria and who are enrolled in special education and LED programs to participate in Chapter 1 fully.

Another principle, and really the principle that is at the heart of Chapter 1 by my reckoning, and that is viable parent involvement. And the word "viable" is essential. We have parent involvement; we need viable parent involvement. We have to ensure that parents are full partners in the planning and the development of programs, have a full cognizance of what is being outlined for their individual children. They must be empowered to act positively and continuously in their children's education. Training programs must be developed, capacity-building programs, programs for school administrators and teachers to better work with parents. And underscoring our efforts in Chapter 1 must be this major commitment to viable, meaningful parent involvement.

Earlier, I mentioned briefly our relationship with the nonpublic school groups, and in particular the Catholic Conference, and I should note that while we had good meetings, I am not going to suggest to you that we were in full agreement. The chiefs continue to take a position, and will continue to take a position, in opposition to any form of a voucher plan. However, having said that, we did agree with the nonpublic schools that it was absolutely essential that we work cooperatively to ensure adequate—that adequate new funds are available for—and effective procedures are in place to ensure that youngsters enrolled in the nonpublic schools who are eligible receive the commensurate services; in particular this takes on added significance when one considers the Aguilar vs. Felton decision, which has made it very, very difficult for schools to meet their—the requirements of Chapter 1. And we strongly support that moneys be set aside, probably more than the $30 million that has been recommended, to allow for the additional cost to implement that decision and to ensure that all youngsters receive services.

And our thought is that should be a one-time allocation with carryover potential. And I think that is a fair way to do it, because in some districts they would be prepared to move ahead very rapidly; others, it would take planning time. But there is a need for the funding; there is a need for the carryover potential.

We also agreed with the nonpublic school group that there really was a need for incentives to develop alternative, creative approaches to providing service in the nonpublic sector, and in particular I would just highlight the potential for technology, computers. And that is an area that we really have to look at long and hard.

The state role in Chapter 1, and I parenthetically would note, in Chapter 2, I cannot minimize the role that the state must, can, and should play in Chapter 1, Chapter 2, and in educational leadership. Having been a school superintendent and chief state school officer, I really understand the importance of that role. And that is, it should not be seen as, a role to usurp the powers of local school boards or superintendents, but it rather should be seen as a role of leadership, direction, and responsibility.

If you consider the recent reform movement in this country, long overdue, the reform direction has basically come from the states, be it a legislature, a commissioner, or a governor, or any combination thereof. But the leadership has really come from the states. And if you look carefully at the reform packages, and I can cite Connecticut as an example, underlying that entire package is the continued quest for equity and excellence for all of our youngsters. We have raised standards and we have raised expectations for all youngsters.

This at times has not set well with local school districts, but I cannot imagine participating in a program where equity is in the pursuit of mediocrity. So excellence and—equity and excellence walk a wedded path, and higher standards and expectations are indeed our goal.

We also—I also remind you of the state—that each state has constitutional requirements to ensure that equal educational opportunity is provided for students; that suitable programs of instruction are in place; and we have to report annually on the condition of education in our state.

You must also recognize the significant shift in funding to states over the past several years. In 1973 the states picked up approximately 43 percent of the cost of education. Today we pick up more than 50 percent of the cost, and that is increasing. And I would suggest the states not only have been involved in the reform movement and not only have used the appropriate rhetoric, but they have provided dollars to support the rhetoric, and I know there are some who come before you, especially at the federal level, and use rhetoric but not—do not necessarily recommend the funds commensurate with implementing that rhetoric. I think the states have been very sincere in their efforts.

Also, when you look at state initiatives in an area that you are critically interested in, compensatory education, the Chapter 1, Chapter 2 programs, a number of states have mounted very substantial programs in compensatory education. As one commissioner, I can tell you, in Connecticut we have programs not only in compensatory education, but bilingual education. We have a priority school district program where we drive money to the 20 lowest-scoring districts; it is a categorical grant. We have a specific summer school program for disadvantaged youth. We are providing more than 750 trachers in the state of Connecticut over three years to districts to improve their student teacher ratios, and 90 percent of those teachers go to Hartford, New Haven, and Bridgeport, the districts with the greatest need. And just about every one of our grants is equalized to ensure that dollars go to the communities with the greatest needs.

Also, in trying to emphasize the state role and the importance, I remind you that this year the chiefs have devoted the year to children at risk in this country, and David Hornbeck and the organization are truly committed to this effort.

Another important reference which emphasizes the state role, most of you have read the National Governors Association report. I think that is appropriately entitled A Time for Results. Governors want results, commissioners want results, parents want results, and you want results. And you really should hold states accountable for what is happening. Governors are holding us accountable.

You are talking about a program in Chapter 1 of approximately $4 billion. You are talking about a national expenditure of approximately $250 billion for education, of which the states fund 50 percent. There must be a level of accountability for those dollars; there must be a level of accountability in terms of the education which children are receiving in this country.

And I was absolutely pleased and delighted to hear and to read the positions of the various advocacy groups, which are very strong in stating they want states to be responsible, they want states to be accountable.

We accept that challenge; we seek that opportunity. But in order to carry out that role, the reauthorization must give consideration to the dollars commensurate with that awesome responsibility, and the recommendation for $1.5 million for state administration—I am sorry, 1.5 percent for state administration and one percent for technical assistance would go a long way to ensuring that states can meet that broad responsibility.

And I do take exception, strong exception, although I respect their position, with groups that come forward and talk about a diminished state role. I really think, in many respects, that is an unconscionable position when you look at the myriad responsibilities of states, when you look at what governors are expecting, when you look at the accountability factor, when you look at the number of youngsters we have in our schools across this country who are not achieving anywhere near grade level, the states must play a leadership role. I cannot imagine the federal government being responsible for thousands of local school districts, nor can I imagine thousands of individual models of accountability. Somehow there has to be this partnership, not an adversarial partnership, but a partnership.

Just quickly, Chapter 2, some brief comments, and I have with me today Arvin Blome from Colorado, who is the Associate Commissioner, and Sally Mentor, who is an assistant superintendent in

California responsible for Chapter 2. Arvin is here, and Sally, as resource persons in Chapter 2.

We support, the chiefs support, strongly the broad national priorities which are being recommended for Chapter 2. We support the stronger provisions for evaluation to demonstrate program results. And we very much support the continued emphasis on flexibility.

This flexibility allows states, allows chief state school officers, a part of "quick response funds" for new challenges and new priorities, and we support the flexibility in terms of looking at particular categories, including at-risk youth, effective schools, basic skills and critical subjects, staff development, and more recently, attention being drawn to talented and gifted youngsters. We support all of that.

And we support the idea that local communities could make decisions as to their priorities and states could make decisions as to their priorities. This, to me, speaks well for your efforts.

Chapter 2 is a program that has worked extremely well in the states, and generally speaking, it is supported at the local level. I know in Connecticut we have an excellent relationship with out statewide task force and with the program coordinators.

I would offer one quick caveat. As you look at Chapter 2 and you look at the administrative setaside and reauthorization, and while I absolutely support any direction to move toward effective schools funding, I just would add a particular caution that, hopefully, the reauthorization will take into consideration that there are a number of states, including Connecticut, where we have spent large amounts of state dollars to implement instructionally effective schools. And in my state we have a whole bureau devoted to that effort. I would just hope that somehow, some way in the reauthorization, that can be taken under consideration, because what may happen is some of the dollars we now have to look at other programs like desegregation and summer school and special activities we may not have funds for if we have to shift them.

But at the same time, I would support fully efforts to ensure that states where they do not have effective schools, dollars are provided to allow them to move in that direction.

This is a very important year. This reauthorization can very well set the tone for the next several years, public education in our country. The stakes are very high. We are talking about youngsters with the greatest need, and I can assure you the chief state school officers are prepared to work closely with you, cooperatively with you, provide any information and materials you need to address the myriad issues you are confronting. We want to be full partners, we absolutely support you for your efforts and your commitment to at-risk youth, and we sincerely hope the citizens of this country will support all of us, because ultimately we are dealing with those youngsters who will be the citizens of tomorrow, and if they are at risk today, they are going to be at risk tomorrow.

I thank you for this opportunity, and I would be happy to answer your questions.

[The prepared statement of Gerald Tirozzi follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GERALD TIROZZI, COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, STATE OF CONNECTICUT, REPRESENTING COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

Mr. Chairman, I am Gerald N. Tirozzi, Commissioner of Education for the State of Connecticut. I am honored to have the opportunity to testify on behalf of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) regarding the reauthorization of federal programs for our Nation's elementary and secondary school children.

The Council is a professional organization composed of the commissioners and superintendents of education from each of the fifty states, six extra-territorial jurisdictions, and the District of Columbia. Members of the Council are the principal administrators of the public school systems in each state. As such, we are responsible, as are our colleagues at the local level, for implementing federal and state education policies and programs for the Nation's schools.

To prepare for the reauthorization of these vital elementary and secondary programs, the Council undertook a year-long process, involving state education agency staff, to develop our recommendations to Congress. The Council's policy and legislative proposals were adopted at the 1986 Annual Meeting in November. At the same time, the Council adopted the needs of at risk youth as CCSSO's 1987 theme and study issue.

I would like to submit for the record the Council's recommendations for reauthorization which were submitted to your Committee on December 31, 1986. However, the most significant part of our process has taken place since the beginning of the year. The Council initiated a series of historic meetings with a broad coalition of child advocacy groups and non-public school organizations. These meetings focused on our common goals and concerns—that Chapter 1 serve as many eligible children as possible, particularly those with the greatest needs, and that the services provided be of the highest quality.

These meetings resulted in a consensus between chief state school officers and child advocates on a number of fundamental principles about Chapter 1. We agreed that the goal of Chapter 1 is to permit children served to attain the educational achievement expected of all children at their grade level. We agreed that a locally-determined process of setting goals and evaluating the progress of Chapter 1 schools and children served is necessary for a quality program. We agreed on the essential nature of parent involvement in the program and the child's progress in it, as well as on the value of school-wide projects and concentration grants to target those children most in need with the best possible service. Finally, we agreed that the states must be responsible and accountable for achieving these program goals and have the resources to do so.

Similarly, mutual agreements were reached between chief state school officers and non-public school organizations on the need for adequate new funds and timely, effective procedures for insuring that children eligible for Chapter 1 in private schools receive the services they deserve. We favor the use of technology—computers and telecommunications—in alternative delivery systems. We see these needs as particularly urgent due to the cost and disruption of service that has occurred since the *Aguilar* vs. *Felton* decision was made.

H.R. 950, the Special Education Needs Act of 1987, captures the spirit and incorporates many of CCSSO's recommendations on Chapter 1. Most importantly, H.R. 950 builds on Chapter 1 as the foundation of compensatory education for educationally deprived children, and as the cornerstone in the continuum of programs for these children, programs which include Head Start, TRIO, Pell grants, and adult education.

As the Council recommended, you have added new components to maximize Chapter 1's potential for breaking the cycle of poverty and illiteracy through preschool services that include parents and the secondary basic skills and dropout program. H.R. 950 correctly recognizes the essential nature of parent involvement to the success of Chapter 1. The bill also opens the door for better targetting to funds to children most in need through provisions to expand the school-wide project option and extension of concentration grants. I would like to commend you, Mr. Chairman, and this Committee on the trust of the legislation and its focus on the integral role Chapter 1 has in the education of at risk children.

A few years ago, a landmark report alerted educators and the American people that we were "A Nation At Risk". That report, along with the many other sound studies that preceded and followed it, generated a wave of educational reform throughout the states. I find it highly appropriate that in this phase of the reform movement, the term "at risk" has taken on a new meaning. Today's focus is on the children at risk. Our attention is on the 22% of children living in poverty, the 40 teenagers a day who give birth to their third child, the 60% of children born in 1983 who will live in a single parent home before age 18, and the majority of students in some urban areas who will drop out of school before graduation.

The federal government took the lead over twenty years ago in addressing the need for equity in education, through the enactment of historic civil rights legislation and Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. However, the states—including chief state school officers, governors, legislatures, and our colleagues at the local level—have led the current quest for educational excellence. It is also the states taking the lead to insure that excellence is attainable for all children and that the risks faced by our most vulnerable children are reduced.

The aggressive role states are taking in educational reform is evidenced by the dramatic increase in state spending on education. Coupled with equalization, the states', investment has meant more funds for our cities with the highest numbers of children at risk. State support of the total cost of public eduction has risen from 43% in 1973 to over 50% by 1985. During the same period, the percentage of federal support declined from over 8% to 6.3%, and the local share declined from 49% to about 45%. In past decade, average per pupil expenditures increased by 300% and teacher salaries more than doubled.

States' commitment to education has been more than financial. We have raised expectations for administrators, teachers and students. Dollars and manpower have been directed to better training and preparation of educational personnel. We are improving curricula and testing to insure that the high school diploma is a meaningful credential of basic academic knowledge and skills. Higher standards for students have been accompanied by efforts to insure all students can attain a meaningful education.

For example, several states have enacted laws entitling their citizens to basic levels of educational achievement. Twenty states have their own compensatory education programs, and some, like South Carolina, have initiated or expanded such programs to insure disadvantaged students can attain higher educational standards. Sixteen states have bilingual or other programs for limited English proficient students. Nearly half the states have a wide range of early childhood education programs.

Dropout prevention and the needs of at risk children are at the top of the governors' agenda, as they are the top priorities of chief state school officers. The Council has embarked on a year-long study to identify the characteristics of children at risk and develop model state and federal legislation to address their needs. CCSSO, in collaboration with the Center for Educational Statistics and our members, has developed a model definition of dropout and standard indicators of student achievement.

Its due to this commitment that chief state school officers have been able to join the national associations representing children and parents in recommendations to this Committee to further strengthen Chapter 1. The issues are simple: What is good for kids? Who will be held accountable? It is in the answers to these questions that we have found our common ground.

I am submitting for the record a series of joint principles on which we agree with child advocates and non-public schools. These principles will be brought before the joint conference of chief state school officers and state boards of education next week for approval. They form the basis of CCSSO's recommendations for amendments. All the principles can be summarized quite simply: Whether we are talking about the expectations for each child and school participating in the program, serving the children most in need, or insuring parents are involved, we are looking for results and we are expecting all partners in the program to be accountable.

I mentioned earlier the current relevance of the report "A Nation At Risk". The National Governor's Association 1991 Report, "A Time for Results", is equally relevant. It is a time for results in education. The American people expect it. Congress knows that it is essential to our competitiveness in world markets. Most of all, unless those 22% of the Nation's children and their families who live in poverty can expect the same results from our education system, we have failed them, and ourselves.

The responsibility and accountability for educational results does not rest at one level of government, nor on the shoulders of the individual, the family, or one particular social institution. A few days ago, this Committee heard testimony—for the first time I understand—from national business leaders on Chapter 1. Private industry is indeed a partner in meeting the needs of at risk children, for business is part of their communities and these children are tomorrow's workforce. States are partners as well.

The Council's recommendations for amendments to Chapter 1 recognize the states' responsibilities in the partnership. They are twofold: We must be accountable partners, with our colleagues at the local level, for effective and efficient administration, monitoring and evaluation and have adequate resources to do so. Secondly, we must be helpful partners to our colleagues at the local level in building the capacity of the education system in our states to serve more Chapter 1 children better, and we must have the resources to do so. In short, we want to offer a helping hand, not a heavy hand, to local districts in our mutual goal of quality and equity in education.

The partnership is particularly essential in light of the Council's first recommendation for Chapter 1—that funds be made available to provide every eligible child the scope and intensity of services needed to succeed in school. We know that Congress cannot do that in the foreseeable future. However, Congress can insure the resources we can devote to this program are achieving the results we want, by providing adequate funds and provisions for accountability of each level of program administration. Congress can encourage all states to provide their own compensatory education programs by reauthorizing and funding the state incentive grants and removing statutory barriers to efficient coordination of these services with Chapter 1. Congress can provide states the resources to assist local education agencies through technical assistance, training, research and demonstrations, dissemination of models and innovative practices, and bonuses for effective projects and teachers.

The Council is aware that some members of this Committee have raised concerns about the portion of state department of education budgets that are federally-funded. The issue of federal versus state support for state education agencies should be weighed against the federal share (6%) versus the state share (50%) of the total cost of education. Many of the state education staff whose salaries are paid with federal funds are providing direct assistance to local districts. In addition, much of the state agency budget is directly related to the cost of administering federal programs. In Michigan, for example, the agency is administering federal programs such as vocational rehabilitation and performing Social Security disability determinations.

The Council is aware of provisions in H.R. 950 which prohibit states from restricting uses of Chapter 1 funds by local education agencies beyond those contained in the federal law. Although the few states with such restrictions have done so in a conscientious effort to target limited and declining resources to basic academic skills, the Council does not object to the Committee's effort to insure local flexibility.

Moreover, the Council would like to submit for the Committee's record the many examples of state-local partnerships for better education of children at risk. The fact is, in most of the states across the nation, states and local education agencies are partners in the quest for quality education for all children. Local districts more often look to the states for assistance, support and capacity-building, then find their efforts thwarted by bureaucracy and red tape. While chief state school officers acknowledge that the states have a ways to go in providing adequate help to our children locked in urban poverty, the will and commitment is there.

In crafting H.R. 950, this Committee has shown its commitment to the neediest of our children and the federal responsibility to be a supportive partner in their education. I believe that states, like parents and child advocates, teachers and local educators, are showing our commitment as well. As key partners in the responsibility for educating our Nation's children, chief state school officers would like to continue to work with you on provisions for Chapter 1 reauthorization that will reflect a sound state role.

While my remarks have focused on Chapter 1, the principles of partnership and accountability have formed the basis of the Council's recommendations on Chapter 2, audit reform, and other elementary and secondary programs as well. I would like to turn for a moment to Chapter 2.

Serving as resources for my testimony today are Arvin Blome, Associate Commissioner of the Colorado Department of Education, and Sarah Mentor, the Chapter 2 Coordinator for the State of California. Their presence here recognizes the hard work the Chapter 2 Steering Committee has contributed to the development and advocacy of the Council's positions on the program. I wish to thank the Committee, particularly the Ranking Member and Chairman, for incorporating many of our ideas in your reauthorization proposal.

We hope to continue to work with you on provisions that will afford state and local education agencies adequate flexibility to meet national priorities in educational reform and equity. We are pleased the Committee is retaining the state share of the program. We appreciate your willingness to identify broad national priorities for the program, permit states and local districts to provide a rationale for their choices among the priorities, and respond to concerns about the program your colleagues on the funding committees have raised with stronger provisions for evaluation to demonstrate program results.

Chapter 2 is particularly popular with chief state school officers because its flexibility provides a pot of "quick response" funds for new challenges and priorities within the states. We are particularly pleased that you are receptive to allowing states continued flexibility to use a significant portion of the funds, beyond administrative costs and effective school activities, for other high priorities such as the needs of at risk youth, instructional program improvement, and personnel development. It is also encouraging that the Committee recognizes in the reauthorization the need for states to provide both technical assistance, as well as direct grants, in these activities.

The Council would like to continue to work with you on these issues between now and your mark-up of Chapter 2. One area of interest to us is the definition of "technical assistance" in the bill—what activities it encompasses. We feel, as we did last year, that on-going effective school activities by states should be credited against the required portion of the state share to be spent on such activities. Another concern is that the means of an adequate federal-state partnership in building the educational database and assessing the quality of schooling and student achievement be provided. CCSSO believes that through the education provisions of the trade bill or the elementary and secondary reauthorization, there must be an authority and funding outside of Chapter 2 to accomplish these objectives.

Finally, the Council would like to praise this Committee's work on audit reform, including the staff resources and time you have devoted to the issue and your receptiveness to the states' concerns. We all want an audit and appeals system that works and a process within the Department of Education for implementing programs and providing guidance that is fair and sound. It is the children who lose when states and local districts lose resources and time on frivolous audit exceptions.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to present these comments on behalf of chief state school officers and look forward to responding to your questions.

Chairman Hawkins. Thank you, Mr. Tirozzi.

The next witness is Dr. Ray Terrell. May the Chair take this opportunity of welcoming Ray Terrell to the committee. He is a personal friend, and he is also the Dean of the School Education, California State University at Los Angeles, which is the second largest teacher training institution in the country.

Ray has been involved in many activities at both the community level as well as in the public schools and the university level in California. And it is with great pride that I have the opportunity of inviting him as a witness today. It is not usual that we have anyone west of the Mississippi, and certainly one whose credentials are as distinguished as that of Dr. Ray Terrell.

And it is a real pleasure for the Chair to have Dr. Ray Terrell as a witness. And, Ray, we look forward to your testimony this morning.

STATEMENT OF DR. RAY TERRELL, DEAN, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AT LOS ANGELES

Dr. Terrell. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to take the opportunity to focus my testimony very specifically in the area of Chapter 2, and deal with the concept of effective schools as we see it.

Let me just say a little bit of background also in terms of my representation here. I do want to address the issue of what is occurring, as I see it, in schools of education, but I also spent a good bit of time as one of the members of the planning group that planned what was a national conference on the education of black children, which occurred in September of last year, where educators, heads of most of the major organizations that affect the black community, and a large number of grassroots people attended, and kind of also share some of the consensus and concerns that came out of that conference as a look was taken nationally at what is happening with the education of black youngsters.

And I am going to suggest that what is happening in the education of black youngsters is what is happening in the education of most minority students and most poor students across the nation, and that is a continual depiction of what I would call a deplorable state, as I look at—continue to look at what are standardized test scores. Clearly, the level of education that one would expect is not being attained, in the main.

Demographic indicators clearly point out that this group of students is going to populate most of our urban centers in the future, and therefore I would suggest that enlightened self-interest would suggest that we take a look at a way to seriously turn around the downturn, I am going to suggest, in educational outcomes for these youngsters.

And if we look at it, and we get away from all the moral and sociological implications, if for no other reason, the economic drain, the potential for violence, and just for the perpetuation of the values of democratic society, I think it is necessary that we look at a way to make the schooling for these youngsters much more effective. What we do know when we take a look at the research is that there are slum schools in these settings with poor minority students that in fact are doing better than other schools. Those schools have been identified as effective schools.

What we found is, and we talk about the flexibility that abides in Chapter 2, is that the effective schools program by its very nature is a program that allows for that flexibility. It is a set of principles—there is no formula, no specific formula, no recipe whereby schools become effective. There are a set of principles, though, which, when they are put in place in schools, seem to achieve results that are acceptable and that are productive for the students in those particular schools.

The effective schools movement has an early beginning, and from my position as Dean of the School of Education at Cal State, Los Angeles, we are introducing the concepts of effective schools to those who are in teacher training and who are in administrative preparation in our schools of education. What we become aware of is that as these students enter the local schools, within a year's time, they look very much like the folks who are already there, and the things that we teach them about effective schools as relates to high expectation and other kinds of things are soon lost, and they soon take on some of the cynicism of existing persons who are in schools.

Therefore, and I agree with the previous speaker, the area that we have to attack is the local school unit. There has to be change made at that level. And what I see is that Chapter 2 affords an opportunity for us to do that.

To take a look at implementing effective schools in those settings and to provide an incentive for schools to make the change at the school site, when we look at the dimensions that are talked, what we discover is that there is need for resources for in-service training at those local school sites to make effective schools become a reality.

I think that, while there is lip service given to the concept, very frequently, without some basis of support, I do not think the schools are going to make much of a move or much of a commitment to work in the area of effective schools. The other phenomenon that we learn about effective schools is, aside from strong leadership, it involves an awful lot of hard work, and I am going to suggest that anytime you talk about hard work, you also have to talk about providing a base of incentives for that to occur.

When we think about how do you move to provide the incentives, and as we look, and a kind of a consensus is that there is not going to be an awful lot of new money that is going to be available, and there is no need for it. What we are suggesting is that moneys be earmarked in Chapter 2 that will specifically provide incentives that will lead schools, local schools, persons to start to work on developing the process of effective schools at the local schoolsite level.

And what we discover again is that what is needed at a local schoolsite to make a school effective varies from school to school. So it is going to take a local initiative in order to reach the goals that we are seeking to reach, if we are going to get there.

The other phenomenon is, and I hope that we can also look at a way to track, to research, to have some involvement for the state, from the state level, to return, if you will, somewhat to categorical funding. And do not—and I think that we have to do that by being very specific in, again, earmarking the money specifically to support the concept of effective schools.

What we are beginning to find is that is those schools that are effective, and when we talk about effective schools, we are talking about schools where students are achieving at grade level, or at 50th percentile or above, that we are capable of doing that. And as Edmonds indicates, we only had to do it once in one school that is earmarked as minority and poor to prove that it can be done.

I do not know of anything currently that is occurring in terms of school improvement that has better chance for success than the implementation of the effective schools proposals. Again, I would again reiterate, and I think what is most important, that it is not a particular formula, but rather a set of variables which, when supported by strong leadership and hard work, proves to be successful. And I think that is the direction that we need to look in reauthorization of Chapter 2.

I do not think that the implementation of effective schools as a designation in Chapter 2 will take away the flexibility that exists, and that was one of the strong points that all the supporters of the bill that I have talked to have been very pleased with. It does not put a straitjacket on what happens at the local schoolsite.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Raymond D. Terrell follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF RAYMOND D. TERRELL, ED.D., DEAN, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES

I have spent the last twenty years of my life developing expertise for servicing school districts confronting problems incident to desegregation, minority underachievement, and standard English language acquisition. I have served as a consultant to most of the large school districts in America. I have been a Title IV Advisory Specialist, the Director of two ESAA Projects and the Principle Investigator of the Region IX Race Desegregation Assistance Center. In all of these roles it has been necessary to provide technical assistance and training for school personnel who were working with poor and minority students.

The educational outcomes for poor and minority students in our country continue to reflect lower test scores, higher dropout rates and a strong likelihood of a substandard quality of life. As our nation shifts from an industrial and manufacturing economy to a service, technological and information run society, the uneducated and undereducated citizenry will become an increasingly expensive liability on the economy. Their inability to be productive and contributing members of our society could severely damage the very fabric of all that America stands for. Those among us who are serious about preserving the freedoms, values and the underpinning economic reality of a democratic society are eager to seek processes which are likely to ensure that equitable educational inputs are afforded to all students, and to monitor to assure that equitable outcomes are obtained.

As we seek ways to positively intervene in the lives of Black and Brown youngsters who are underachieving, there are some notable examples of success models which work. Dr. Ronald Edmonds engaged in a series of research efforts which allowed him to identify the common elements which lead to some poor and minority schools being successful, which other schools with similar socio-economic and racial/ethnic variables were experiencing continued patterns of failure. Dr. Edmonds called the successful models Effective Schools.

Basically, an effective school is one where the students are achieving at the 50th percentile or above and/or achieving at grade level or above on standardized scores. The definition became significant when it is applied to schools which were mainly populated by poor and minority students. He also recognized schools which started with exceptionally low test scores and demonstrated steady improvement from year to year. These schools are said to be moving toward being effective. However, in order for a school to be fully annointed as effective it had to meet the standard of achieving at or above the median and maintain that level of achievement over an extended period of time.

When we consider that H.R. 5 addresses the overall goal of school improvement, it seems reasonable to seek some level of funding which will permit poor amd minority schools to implement programs designed to improve their effectiveness. When Chapter 2 was created through the consolidation of funds and programs, one of the programs included in it was the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA). ESAA funded activities which provided assistance to schools where students were deemed to be suffering harm as the result of racial isolation. These harms included high dropout rates, low test scores, poor self esteem and an overall predictable failure syndrome. A classic example can be found when one examines the scores from California's mandated state tests for third and sixth graders. The 1984-85 scores found that only six schools with populations which are 50% or more Black or Brown achieved scores in the top quartile. It is predicted that California schools will be more than 50% combined minority by 1990. This population distribution is likely to be what the majority of America's public schools will look like in our major populations centers. It is imperative that the systematic processes which are producing failure must be changed.

All indicators point to the reality that schools are going to have to recruit an increased number of teachers because of population growth and an increasing number of teacher retirements. However, more than half of the teachers who are in schools now will be in positions long enough to affect the lives of the current generation. Research indicates that significant changes which will make educational outcomes better for students will be attained on a school by school basis. Positive change rarely occurs for a total district. This can best be noted when one examines the largest 20 school districts across America. Findings will indicate that schools which are populated by poor and minority students are reflecting low achievement and high dropout rates. There will be a few exceptions, however, most will not be deemed as effective. This indicates that the district has found no systematic way to assist in developing positive outcomes for poor and minority students.

The Region IX Desegregation Assistance Center has developed training modules based on four of the five indicators of effective schools. Our training programs have demonstrated that neither teachers nor administrators are aware of the theories which underpin these basic principles. They also fail to be knowledgable about the practices and behaviors which will maximize the learning outcomes for poor and minority students. It is not an issue of intentional racism which perpetuates poor academic performance, but rather a lack of skills and information available to school personnel who work in these settings. In order to break this cycle some schools of education are introducing the five indicators necessary for success to their future teachers. In my current role as Dean of the second largest teacher training institution in America, I know that we are just beginning to incorporate the basic principles which can assist a school to be effective into our pre-service program. This is an important step forward, however, if we wait until this process is effective, America will lose an entire generation of children.

The obvious alternative is to provide funding which will allow school personnel to use in-service programs to improve their local site so that they can be counted among the ranks of effective schools. To paraphrase Dr. Edmonds, we only have to have one successful model where poor and minority students are excelling in their academic programs in order to prove that it can be done. Such models currently exist in New York, Los Angeles, St. Louis, Milwaukee, San Diego and some other major cities in our country. The problem is that these models are isolated examples when we array them alongside the massive numbers of failures.

Chapter 2 funds provides an excellent opportunity to take an existing resource and focus a portion of it in an area that has a proven track record which leads to success. It will allow the federal government to intervene in a way which has the potential to achieve the aims expected from special project funds without inventing new programs, without obligating massive amounts of new monies and without implementing new layers of bureaucracy to monitor progress. What will occur is that local school sites will have the opportunity to assess their needs to determine which of the five principles are needed to improve their effectiveness. Once local initiative is taken to provide staff development programs for school personnel, then improved academic achievement becomes a real possibility.

Effective schools focus on changes designed to improve outcome gains for students, and all of the processes are under the control of school personnel. The research acknowledges that in the best of all worlds, support and involvement from parents and the community are desirable. However, all indicators point to the fact that schools which have strong leadership, high expectations for students, a safe and clean environment, clearly defined and stated goals and an effective system to monitor and evaluate the performance of all persons in the school, produce students who are academically successful. The excuses which educators use to fault parents or the neighborhood environment are removed in this model and school personnel become accountable for learning outcomes.

SUMMARY

1. Poor and minority students are at great risk in our public schools reflected by low achievement and high dropout rates.
2. Schools need more and better prepared teachers to meet the needs of an endangered and growing student population.
3. Past federal programs intended to assist at risk students have a checkered pattern of success.
4. Current programs which have demonstrated consistent success are those programs based on Dr. Edmond's five principles for effective schools.
5. Chapter 2 has an opportunity to help expand the number of effective schools by including this program as one legitimate process aimed at school improvement.

See the attached dimensions for determining effective schools and a complete bibliography which reviews the research on effective schools.

RECOMMENDATION

A specific percentage of Chapter 2 funds should be designated for use to implement the principles of Effective Schools.

DIMENSIONS OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING

(By Donald Mackenzie, Educational Researcher, April 1983)

LEADERSHIP DIMENSIONS

Core Elements:

Positive climate and overall atmosphere.
Goal-focused activities toward clear, attainable and relevant objectives.
Teacher-directed classroom management and decision making.
In-service staff training for effective teaching.

Facilitating Elements:

Shared consensus on values and goals.
Long-range planning and coordination.
Stability and continuity of key staff.
District-level support for school improvement.

EFFICACY DIMENSIONS

Core Elements:

High and positive achievement expectations with a constant press for excellence.
Visible rewards for academic excellence and growth.
Cooperative activity and group interaction in the classroom.
Total staff involvement with school improvement.
Autonomy and flexibility to implement adaptive practices.
Appropriate levels of difficulty for learning tasks.
Teacher empathy, rapport, and personal interaction with students.

Facilitating Elements:

Emphasis on homework and study.
Positive accountability; acceptance of responsibility for learning outcomes.
Strategies to avoid nonpromotion of students.
Deemphasis of strict ability grouping; interaction with more accomplished peers.

EFFICIENCY DIMENSIONS

Core Elements:

Effective use of instructional time; amount and intensity of engagement in school learning.
Orderly and disciplined school and classroom environments.
Continuous diagnosis, evaluation, and feedback.
Well-structured classroom activities.
Instruction guided by content coverage.
Schoolwide emphasis on basis and higher order skills.

Facilitating Elements:

Opportunities for individualized work.
Number and variety of opportunities to learn.

REFERENCES

Acland, H. *Streaming in British secondary schools.* Cambridge: Harvard Center for Educational Policy Research, 1972.

Acland, H. *School-centered reform: A study of California's school improvement program.* Palo Alto, Calif.: Bay Area Research Group, Report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1979.

Alexander, K.L., & McDill, E.L. Selection and allocation with schools: Some causes and consequences of curriculum placement. *American Sociological Review;* 1976, 41, 936–980.

Anderson, S.L. Turning around junior highs in the District of Columbia *Educational Leadership.* 1982, *40* (3), 36–40.

Armor, D.J., Conrey-Oseguera, P., Cox, M., King, N., McDonald. L., Pascal, A., Pauley, E., & Zellman, G, *Analysis of the School Preferred Reading Program in selected Los Angeles minority schools.* (ED 130234, Report No. R-2007-LAUSD) Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, 1976.

Atkinson, J.W. (Ed.) *Motives in fantasy, action, and society.* Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand, 1958.

Averch, H.A., Carroll, S.J., Donaldson, T. S., Kiesling, H.J., & Pincus, J. *How effective is schooling? A critical review of research.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications, 1974.

Bangert, R.L. & Kulik, J.A. *Individualized systems of instruction: A meta-analysis of findings in secondary schools.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, March 1982.

Bardwell, R. How feedback functions. *Education Digest,* 1982, *47* (5), 23–26.

Benbow, C. *Review of instructionally effective schooling literature,* New York: Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Columbia University Teachers College (ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series No. 70), 1980.

Benson, C.S., Medrich, E.A., & Buckley, S. A new view of school efficiency: Household time contributions to school achievement. In J.W. Guthrie (ed) *School finance policies and practices.* First Annual Yearbook of the American Educational Finance Association. Cambridge Mass.: Ballinger, 1980.

Block, J.W. Success rate. In C. Denham & A. Lieberman (Eds.), *Time to learn.* Washington, D.C.: Program on Teaching and Learning, National Institute of Education, 1980.

Boocock, S.S. The school as a social environment of learning: Social organization and micro-social process in educational *Sociology of Education,* 1973. *46,* 15–50.

Bowles, S.S., & Gintis, J. *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life.* New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Bloom, B.S. Time and learning. American Psychologist, 1974, *29, 682–688.*

Bloom, B.S. *Human characteristics and school learning* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Bridge. R.G., Judd, C.M., & Moock. P.R. *The determination of educational outcomes: The impact of families, peers, teachers, and schools.* Cambridge. Mass.: Ballinger, 1979.

Brookover, W.B. Beady, C.H., Flood, P.K., Schweitzer, J., & Wisenbaker, *J. School social systems and student achievement: Schools can make a difference.* New York: Praeger. 1979.

Brookover, W.B., Beamer, L., Efthim. H., Hathaway, D., Lezotte, L.W., Miller. S.K., Passalacqua, J., & Tornatzky. L. *Creating effective schools. Holmes Beach: Learning Publications. 1983.*

Brophy, J.E., Stability of teacher effectiveness. *American Educational Research Journal,* 1973. *10,* 245–252.

Brophy, J.E., & Evertson, C.M. *Learning from teaching: A developmental perspective.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon. 1976.

Brophy, J.E., & Evertson, C.M. *Student characteristics and teaching.* New York: Langman, 1981.

Brophy, J.E., & Good, T.L. *Teacher-student relationships: Causes and consequences.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

California State Department of Education. *School effectiveness study: The first year.* Sacramento: Office of Program Evaluation and Research, 1977.

Carroll, J.B. A model of school learning. *Teachers College Record,* 1963, *64,* 722–733.

Carroll, J.B. *Language and thought.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Carroll, J.B. A revisionist model of school learning. *Review of Education,* 1977, *3,* 155–167.

Cicirelli, V.G., Evans, J.W., & Schiller, J.S. The impact of Head Start: A reply to the Report Analysis. *Harvard Educational Review;* 1970, *40,* 105–129.

Cicourel, A.V., Jennings, K.H., Jennings, S.H.M., Leiter, K.C.W., MacKay, R., Mehan. H., & Roth, D.R. (Eds.). *Language use and school performance.* New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Clark, D.L., Lotto, L.S., & McCarthy, M.M. Secondary source study of exceptionality in urban elementary schools. In Phi Delta Kappa, *Why do some urban schools succeed? The Phi Delta Kappa study of exceptional urban elementary schools.* Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa and Indiana University, 1980.

Cohen, E.G. Sociology in the classroom: Setting the conditions for teacher-student interaction. *Review of Educational Research,* 1972, *42,* 441–452.

Cohen, M. Effective schools: Accumulating evidence. *American Education,* January/February 1982, pp. 13–16.

Coltman, J.S., Champbell, E.G., Hobson, C.J., McPartland, J.M., Mood, A.M., Weinfeld, F.D., & York, R.L. *Equality of educational opportunity.* Washington, DC.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

Conant, J.B. *The comprehensive high school: A second report to interested citizens.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Cooley, W.W., & Leinhardt, G. The Instructional Dimensions Study. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis,* 1980, 2(1), 7-25.

Cooley, W.W., & Lohnes, P.R. *Evaluation research in education.* New York. Wiley, 1976.

Cope, R.G. Strategic planning, management, and decision making. (AAHEERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 9). Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education, 1981.

Coulson, J.E. National evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA): A review of methodological issues. *Journal of Educational Statistics.* 1978, *3,* 1–60.

D'Amico, J. Using effective schools studies to create effective schools: No recipes yet. *Educational Leadership,* 1982, *40* (3), 60–62.

Denham, C., & Lieberman, A. (Eds.). *Time to learn.* Washington, D.C.: Program on Teaching and Learning. National Institute of Education, 1980.

Dyer, H.S., Linn, R.L., & Paton, M.J. A comparision of four methods of obtaining discrepancy measures based on observed and predicted school system means on achievement tests. *American Education Research Journal,* 1969, *6,* 591–605.

Edmonds, R.R. *A discussion of the literature and issues related to effective schooling.* Cambridge, Mass.: Center for Urban Studies, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1979. (a)

Edmonds, R.R. Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership,* 1979, *37,* 15–27. (b)

Edmonds, R.R. Some schools work and more can. *Social Policy,* 1979, *9* (2), 28–32. (c)

Edmonds, R.R. Making public schools effective. *Social Policy,* 1981, *12* (2), 56–60.

Edmonds, R.R. Programs of school improvement: An overview. *Educational Leadership,* 1982. *40* (3), 4–11.

Edmonds, R.R., & Frederiksen, J.R. *Search for effective schools: The identification and analysis of city schools that are instructionally effective for poor children.* Cambridge, Mass.: Center for Urban Studies, 1978.

Ellson, D.G. Tutoring. In N.L. Gage (Ed.), *The psychology of teaching methods.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Epstein, J.L., & McPartland, J.M. *Classroom organization and the quality of school life* (Report No. 214). Baltimore: Center for Social Organization of Schools, The Johns Hopkins University, 1976.

Firestone, W.A., & Herriott, R.E. Prescriptions for effective elementary schools don't fit secondary schools. *Educational Leadership,* 1982, *40* (3), 51–53.

Flanders, N.A., & Nuttall, G. (Eds.). The classroom behavior of teachers. *International Review of Education,* 1972. *18,* 427–568.

Frederiksen, J.R., & Edmonds, R.R. *Identification of instructionally effective and ineffective schools.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1979.

Gage, N.L. (Ed.). *The psychology of teaching methods.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Gage, N.L. *The scientific basis of the art of teaching.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1978.

Gall, M.G. The use of questions in teaching. *Review of Educational Research,* 1970, *40,* 707–721.

Gersten, R., Carnine, D., & Green, S. The principal as instructional leader: A second look. *Educational Leadership,* 1982, *40* (3), 47–50.

Glass, G.V., Cahan, L.S., Smith, M.L., & Filby, N.N. *School class size: Research and policy.* Beverly Hills, Calif. Sage, 1982.

Good, T.L., & Grouws, D.A. Teacher rapport: Some stability data. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 1979, *67,* 179–182.(a)

Good, T.L., & Grouws, D.A. Teaching and mathematics learning. *Educational Leadership.* 1979, *37,* 39–45. (b)

Guskin, A.E., & Guskin, S.L. *A social psychology of education.* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1970.

Guthrie, J.W., Kleindorfer, G.B., Levin, H.M., & Stout, R.T. *School and inequality.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1971.

Hanushek, E.A. Throwing money at schools (Discussion Paper No. 8004). Rochester, N.Y.: Public Policy Analysis Program, University of Rochester, 1981.

Harnischfeger, A., & Wiley, D.E. Exposure to schooling: Method, conclusions, policy. *Educational Researcher,* 1976, *5* (2), 18.

Hargreaves, D.H. *Social relations in a secondary school.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967.

Hathaway, W.E. What research tells us about the nature of schools that are exceptionally effective in improving student achievement and about the role of the principal in creating and supporting them. *Notes for discussion with Portland Public Schools principals.* Portland, Ore.: Board of Education, 1982.

Hellmuth, J. (Ed.). *Compensatory education: A national debate.* New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1970.

Henry, J. Attitude organization in elementary school classrooms. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry,* 1957, *27,* 117–133.

Herriott, R.E., & Gross, N. (Eds.). *The dynamics of planned educational change: Case studies and analyses.* Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1979.

Hersh, R.H. *What makes some schools and teachers more effective?* Eugene, Ore.: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, 1981. (Draft)

Heyns, B.L. Social selection and stratification within schools. *American Journal of Sociology,* 1974, *79,* 1434–1451.

Heyns, B.L. *Summer learning and the effects of schooling.* New York: Academic Press, 1978.

Hodgson, G. Do Schools make a difference? In D.M. Levin & M.J. Bane (Eds.). *The "Inequality" controversy: Schooling and distributive justice.* New York: Basic Books, 1975.

House, E.R., Glass, G.V., McLean, LD., & Walker, D.F. No simple answer: Critique of the Follow Through evaluation. *Harvard Educational Review,* 1978, *48,* 128–160.

Hulton, H.B., & DeVries, D.L. *Team competition and group practice: Effects on Student achievement and attitudes* (Report No. 212). Baltimore: Center for Social Organization of Schools, The Johns Hopkins University, 1976.

Jackson, P.W. *Life in classrooms.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

James T., & Tyack, D. Learning from past efforts to reform the high school. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 1983, *64,* 400–406.

Jencks, C.S. What's behind the drop in test scores? *Working Papers,* 1978, *6* (4), 29–41.

Jensen, A.R. How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? *Harvard Educational Review,* 1969, *39,* 1–124.

Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R.T. *Learning together and alone: Cooperation, competition, and individualization.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Kennedy, M.M. Findings from the Follow Through Planned Variations Study. *Educational Researcher,* 1978, *7* (7), 9–17.

Kiesling, H.J. *Multi-variate analysis of schools and educational policy* (Report No. P-4595). Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation. 1971. (a)

Kiesling, H.J. *A study of successful compensatory education projects in California.* Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, 1971. (b)

Klitgaard, R.E., Hall, G.R. *A statistical search for unusually effective schools.* Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, 1973.

Lasley, T.J. & Wayson, W.W. Characteristics of schools with good discipline. *Educational Leadership,* 1982, *40* (3), 28–31.

Leacock, E.B. *Teaching and learning in city schools.* New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Leinhardt, G. Program evaluation: An empirical study of individualized instruction. *American Educational Research Journal,* 1977, *14,* 277–293.

Lightfoot, S.L. *Worlds apart: Relationships between families and schools.* New York: Basic Books, 1978.

Lightfoot, S.L. Portraits of exemplary secondary schools: Highland Park. *Daedalus,* 1981, *110* (4), 59–80.

Mackenzie, D.E. *Leadership for learning: What research shows about effective schools.* Washington, D.C.: National School Boards Association, 1981.

Madaus, G.F., Airasian, P.W., & Kellaghan, T. The effects of standardized testing. *Irish Journal of Education,* 1971, *5,* 70–85.

Madaus, G.F., Airasian, P.W. & Kellaghan, T. *School effectiveness: A reassessment of the evidence.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1980.

Mann, D. (Ed.). *Making change happen*? New York: Teachers College Press, 1978.

Mayeske, G.W., Wisler, C.E., Beaton, A.E. Jr., Weinfeld, F.D., Cohen, W.M., Okada, T., Proshek, J.M., & Tabler, K.A. *A study of our nation's schools.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office (DHEW Publication No. (OE)72–142), 1972.

McCarthy, D.P., Lazarus, A., & Canner, J. *School Improvement Project: A summary of the first annual assessment report.* New York: Office of Educational Evaluation, New York City Public Schools, 1980.

McClelland, D.C. (Ed.). *Studies in motivation.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1955.

McCormick-Larkin, M., & Kritek, W.J. Milwaukee's Project RISE. *Educational Leadership,* 1982, *40* (3), 16–21.

Mehan, H. *Learning lessons; Social lessons: Social organization in the classroom.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Miller, S.K. School learning climate improvement: A case study. *Educational Leadership,* 1982, *40* (3), 36–37.

Minneapolis Board of Education. *Critical choices: The climate for learning in the Minneapolis Public Schools.* Minneapolis, Minn.: Minneapolis Public Schools Discussion Package No. 8, 1981.

Morrison, B., & McIntyre, A. (Eds.). *The social psychology of teaching.* Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972.

Mosteller, F., & Moynihan, D.P. (Eds.). *On "Equality of Educational Opportunity": Papers deriving from the Harvard University faculty seminar on the Coleman Report.* New York: Random House, 1972.

Muir, R, A teacher implements changes using the BTES framework. In C. Denham & A. Lieberman (Eds.). *Time to learn.* Washington, D.C.: Program on Teaching and Learning, National Institute of Education, 1980.

Murnane, R.J. *Interpreting the evidence on school effectiveness.* Working Paper No. 830. New Haven, Conn.: Institute for Social and Policy Studies, Yale University, 1980.

Murphy, J.F., Weil, M., Hallinger, P., & Mitman, A. Academic press: Translating high expectations into school policies and classroom practices. *Educational Leadership,* 1982, *40* (3), 22-26.

Nachtigal, P.M. *Improving rural schools,* Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1980.

National Institute of Education. *The effects of services on student development.* Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1977.

New York State Department of Education. *School factors influencing reading achievement: A case study of two inner-city schools.* Albany, N.Y.: State Office of Education, 1974.

Peterson, P.L., & Walberg, H.J. (Eds.). *Research on teaching: Concepts, findings, and implications.* Berkeley, Calif: McCutchan, 1979.

Pettigrew, T.F. Social evaluation theory. Convergences and applications. In D. Levine (Ed.). *Nebraska symposium on motivation.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967.

Phi Delta Kappa. *Why do some urban schools succeed? The Phi Delta Kappa study of exceptional urban elementary schools.* Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa and Indiana University, 1980.

Powell, M. New evidence for old truths. *Educational Leadership,* 1979, *37,* 49-51.

Project Equality. *Preparation for college in the 1980s.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1981.

Purkey, S.C., & Smith, M.S. Too soon to cheer? Synthesis of research on effective schools. *Educational Leadership,* 1982, *40* (3), 64-69.

Rist, R.C. Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prohecy in ghetto education. *Harvard Educational Review,* 1970, *40,* 411-451.

Roberts, J.L. *Scene of the battle, Grouop behavior in urban classrooms.* Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday, 1971.

Rosenbaum, J.E. *Making inequality: The hidden curriculum of high school tracking.* New York: Wiley, 1976.

Rosenshine, B.V. Rencent research on teaching behaviors and student achievement. *Journal of Teacher Education.* 1976, *27,* 61-65.

Rosenshine, B.V. Academic engaged time, content covered, and direct instruction. *Journal of Education,* 1978, *160* (3), 38-66.

Rosenshine, B.V., & Berliner, D.C. Academic engaged time. *British Journal of Teacher Education,* 1978, *4,* 3-16.

Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. *Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectations and pupils' intellectual development.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Rutter, M., Maugham, B., Moritmore, P., Ouston, J., & Smith, A. *Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.

St. John, N.H. *School desegregation: Outcomes for children.* New York: Wiley, 1975.

Schafer, W.E., & Olexa, C. *Tracking and opportunity: The shutting-out process and beyond.* Scranton, Pa.: Chandler, 1971.

Schweinhardt, L.J., & Weikart, D.P. *Young children group up: The effects of the Perry Preschool Project on youths through age 15* (Monograph No. 7). Ypsilanti, Mich.: High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 1980.

Selden, R. *Briefing paper: Higher-order skills involved in the basics—redning, writing, and mathematics.* Washington, D.C.: Program on Teaching and Learning, National Institute of Education, 1982.

Shapson, S.M., Wright, E.N., Eason, G., & Fitzgerald, J. An experimental study of the effects of class size. *American Educational Research Journal,* 1980, *17,* 141-152.

Slavin, R.E. Classroom reward structure: An analytical and practical review. *Review of Educational Research,* 1977, *47,* 633-650.

Slavin, R.E. Cooperative learning: A research synthesis. *Educational Leadership,* 1981, *38,* 644-660.

Smith, M.S., & Bissell, J.S. Report analysis: The impact of Head Start. *Harvard Educational Review,* 1970, *40,* 41-104.

Soar, R.S. & Soar, R.M. An empirical analysis of selected Follow Through programs: An example of a process approach to evaluation. In I.J. Gordon (Ed.), *Early childhood education.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Stallings, J.A. Implementation and child effects of teaching practices in Follow Through classrooms. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development,* 1975, *40,* 1-119.

Stallings, J.A. What research has to say to administrators of secondary schools about effective teaching and staff development. In K. Duckworth, E. Kehoe, W. DeBevoise, & F. Donovan (Eds.), *Creating conditions for effective teaching.* Eugene, Ore.: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, 1981.

Stallings, J.A., & Kaskowitz, D.H. *Follow Through classroom observation evaluation 1971-1973.* Menlo Park, Calif.: Stanford Research Institute, 1974.

Stow, S.B. Using effectiveness research in teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership,* 1979, *37,* 55-58.

Summers, A.A., & Wolfe, B.L. Which school resources help learning? Efficiency and equity in Philadelphia Public Schools (ED 139847). *IRCD Bulletin,* 1979, *11,* 1-15.

Tomlinson, T.M. Effective schools: Mirror or mirage? *Today's Education,* April/May 1981, pp. 48-50.

Tomlinson, T.M. Review of W.B. Brookover et. al., "Creating effective schools." *Educational Leadership,* 1982, *40* (3), 72-73.

Venezky. R.L., & Winfield, L.F. Schools that succeed beyond expectations in teaching. (Studies in Education Technical Report No. 1). Newark: University of Delaware, 1979.

Wang, M. *Evaluating the effectiveness of compensatory education.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980.

Weber, G. *Inner-city children can be taught to read: Four successful schools.* Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education, 1971.

Williams, F. Whitehead, J.L., & Miller, L. Relations between language attitudes and teacher expectancy. *American Educational Research Journal,* 1972, *7,* 447-491.

Wiley, D.E., & Harnischfeger, A. Explosion of a myth: Quantity of schooling and exposure to instruction, major educational vehicles. *Educational Research,* 1974, *3* (4), 7-12.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Dr. Terrell.

The next witness is Dr. Brenda Turnbull. Dr. Turnbull.

STATEMENT OF DR. BRENDA TURNBULL, PRINCIPAL ASSOCIATE, POLICY STUDIES ASSOCIATES

Dr. TURNBULL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman I am pleased to be here.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I was a member of the senior staff for a national study of the local operations of Chapter 2. SRI International and my firm, Policy Studies Associates, conducted this study for the U.S. Department of Education. Dr. Michael Knapp of SRI International directed the study, but he was unable to be here today because of commitments in California, so I was invited to summarize its findings for you.

The national study covered all aspects of local program operations under Chapter 2 in——

Chairman HAWKINS. Dr. Turnbull?

Dr. TURNBULL. Yes.

Chairman HAWKINS. Could you move the instrument a little closer? We are having——

Dr. TURNBULL. Sure.

Chairman HAWKINS [continuing]. Some difficulty in——

Dr. TURNBULL. Sure. Is it——

Chairman HAWKINS [continuing]. Hearing.

That is fine.

Dr. **Turnbull.** OK. Thank you.

The national study covered all aspects of local program operations under Chapter 2 in the 1984-85 school year, which was the program's third year. The data came from a nationally representative survey of 1600 school districts and from interviews in eight state education agencies, 48 school districts, and 166 public and private schools.

Today I would like to describe some of our key findings concerning the distribution of program funds to school districts, the activities that Chapter 2 grants support, including services provided to students who attend private schools, and local decision-making and administration. My written statement contains some tables with some more detailed statistical information.

Most Chapter 2 funds are distributed to school districts according to the size of district enrollment. A typical state distributes 72 percent of its funds this way. Because of the other formula factors, a typical very large or very small district receives a bit more per pupil than the national average. That would be eight or nine dollars as opposed to about $7 per pupil.

Most Chapter 2 grants are modest. Over 90 percent of school districts receive less than $50,000, and over 40 percent receive less than $5,000.

When Chapter 2 replaced the 32 previous programs, 75 percent of districts gained funds. However, the gains and losses were not distributed evenly across districts. For example, about 53 percent of very large urban districts lost money, while 73 percent of very small districts gained.

In studying the activities that Chapter 2 supports, we found a great deal of diversity, but at the same time two types of expenditure are by far the most widespread. The first is purchases of computer hardware or software. 72 percent of districts put some or all of their Chapter 2 funds into these purchases, and nearly 100 million of the 330 million Chapter 2 dollars spent on public schools in 1984-85 went into this area.

We found that districts are using their computers for instruction in core academic areas, usually.

The second dominant type of expenditure is support for libraries, media centers, and other school departments. 68 percent of districts spend, again, nearly 100 million Chapter 2 dollars on these purchases, of which the largest categories are library books and audiovisual materials and equipment.

Staff development is supported by Chapter 2 in 27 percent of districts, and it is much more common in the very large districts, 78 percent of which support some staff development under Chapter 2. Classroom teachers are participants in almost all of the staff development. Principals participate in about half of these districts.

One fourth of districts support the development of curriculum or new programs. Again, this is most common in larger districts. Reading, writing, and computer literacy are areas of focus.

Instructional services are supported by Chapter 2 in 16 percent of districts, but in more than half of the very large districts. Disadvantaged students are the target group for this Chapter 2 instruction in 42 percent of the districts that offer it.

Finally, student support services are found in 15 percent of districts, usually in the form of general purpose guidance and counselling.

Let me make two general points about how Chapter 2 funds are used. First, they are very commonly combined with funds from other sources, sometimes acting as seed money to help get a program such as computer-based instruction off the ground.

Second, they are often spread very widely within a district. They tend to go to all schools, to all types of students, and for several different activities.

On the subject of services for students who attend private schools, we found that 75 percent of the districts that have eligible private schools within their boundaries do serve students attending at least some of these schools. Participation by private school students is greater under Chapter 2 than it was under the antecedent programs. Our analysis shows that this is because the private school officials feel Chapter 2 offers more funds, more flexibility, and less administrative complexity than the previous programs.

Some private school officials still decline to have their students participate, usually because they object to government programs or because the amount of Chapter 2 money available for their students would be very small. Spending patterns are somewhat different for public and private school students. In virtually all districts that serve private school students, Chapter 2 funds purchase instructional materials and equipment for them, and the purchases include computer hardware and software in two thirds of these districts. The other uses are far less common.

Decisions about Chapter 2 spending are usually made by a small number of district-level administrators, and they are usually part of the district's ongoing decision-making about its educational program in general. School-level staff do not usually participate, and school boards and other community members also tend to play a small role.

In studying parent participation in Chapter 2 decision-making, we found that few parents or citizens have sought an active role, and that most districts have not done much to cultivate their participation. However, there were many cases where Chapter 2 spending decisions reflected general community pressure for some educational priority, such as basic skills instruction or computer use in the schools.

District staff do see Chapter 2 as a flexible program that allows them to pursue local goals. In fact, fewer than 10 percent of them say that they are using the funds to address national or state goals.

We did find that the listing of the antecedent programs in the law seems to influence some decisions, because it explicitly authorizes these particular uses of funds.

Finally, most Chapter 2 coordinators report little administrative burden associated with the program. The significant exception is interactions with private schools, especially in very large districts. Otherwise, streamlined administration from the state level and long local experience with other categorical programs combined to make the burden light. The low level of administrative paraphernalia in this program includes the area of evaluation, where the most common activity is simply collecting informal feedback on

Chapter 2 purchases and activities. Fewer than half of districts were collecting even simple statistics on purchases in 1984-85.

I would like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to describe our research findings for your subcommittee.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Brenda J. Turnbull follows:]

STATEMENT OF BRENDA J. TURNBULL, ED. D., PRINCIPAL ASSOCIATE, POLICY STUDIES ASSOCIATES

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I am pleased to have this opportunity to testify about the findings of a National Study of Chapter 2 of the Educational Consolidation and Improvement Act.[1] The U.S. Department of Education initiated and sponsored this study, which was conducted by SRI International of Menlo Park, California, and Policy Studies Associates of Washington, D.C. We gathered information on the local operations of Chapter 2 in its third year, 1984-85, by means of a nationally representative survey of 1,600 school districts and personal interviews in 48 districts, 100 public schools, and 66 private schools in 21 states around the country.

The study was broad in scope, covering all aspects of local program operations. We did not, however, investigate operations at the state level, including the use of the 20 percent of program funds set aside for state uses. In this testimony, I present highlights of our findings under four topics: the distribution of program funds to school districts, the activities that Chapter 2 grants support, the services provided to students attending private schools, and local decisionmaking and administration.

THE DISTRIBUTION OF PROGRAM FUNDS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The National Study fund that Chapter 2 funds tend to follow patterns of district enrollment, although the largest and smallest districts (with enrollments of 25,000 or more or under 600) receive somewhat more per pupil than other districts—$8 or $9 as opposed to around $7 (Table 1).

This distribution pattern reflects the design of state formulas, which distribute a median of 72 percent of funds according to enrollment but also compensate districts with concentrations of high-cost students (often found in the very large urban districts) and districts with sparse populations.

Chapter 2 grants are modest. Over 90 percent of school districts receive less than $50,000 from Chapter 2, and over 40 percent receive less than $5,000.

When Chapter 2 replaced 32 antecedent programs, there was considerable interest in the gains and losses various districts would experience. Our data show the following redistribution of funds between 1981-82, the last year of the antecedent programs, and 1984-85:

Approximately 75 percent of all districts gained funds as a result of the shift to Chapter 2. This figure reflects the fact that many districts, especially smaller ones, had not previously won discretionary grants or were not eligible for funding under the Emergency School Aid Act.

Gains and losses were not distributed evenly across different-sized districts (Table 2).

About 53 percent of very large urban districts lost funds as a result of Chapter 2, while 73 percent of very small districts gained funds.

An average large urban district lost 20 percent of its funding, dropping from $543,923 under the antecedent programs to $433,100 under the first year of Chapter 2. Small districts (600 to 2,499 enrollment) gained the most in percentage terms, 79 percent, going from median funding of $4,946 to $8,841 (Table 3).

WHAT CHAPTER 2 SUPPORTS

The National Study analyzed how extensively Chapter 2 funds are used to support each of six types of activities, and how districts commonly spend their funds in each area. Because larger districts often pay for a wide array of activities under Chapter 2, while most small and very small districts support only one or two activities, the percentage of districts supporting each activity is higher in the larger size categories (Table 4).

---

[1] The complete study findings and methods are described in Michael S. Knapp, Craig H. Blakely, Marian S. Stearns, Rhonda Ann Cooperstein, Christine L. Padilla, Brenda J. Turnbull, Richard N. Apling, and Ellen L. Marks, *The Education Block Grant at the Local Level: The Implementation of Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act in Districts and Schools*, Menlo Park, CA: SIR International, January, 1986, and several companion volumes, all available from SRI International.

72 percent of districts put Chapter 2 funds into *computer applications*—purchases of hardware or software. This use of funds is widespread in districts of all sizes.

Just under $100 million of the $330 million going into the nation's public schools supported computer applications in 1984-85 (Table 5).

Most districts reportedly use the computers for instruction in core academic areas like reading and mater (Table 6).

About half of the districts purchasing hardware or software have also put Chapter 2 funds into related curriculum or staff development. Their purchases are often part of multiyear plans for using new technology.

68 percent provide *support for libraries, media centers, and other school departments*—any purchases of materials and equipment other than computer hardware or software. This use is also common across all district size categories.

Nearly $100 million goes into this area (Table 5).

Over two-thirds of these districts buy library books; half buy audiovisual materials or equipment.

Data from our site visits indicate that these purchases tend to maintain existing library collections or replace worn-out equipment.

27 percent of districts use Chapter 2 funds for *staff development*. The range is broad here, from 78 percent of very large districts to 16 percent of very small districts.

Of these districts, 95 percent provide inservice training for classroom teachers, and 77 percent focus on teaching techniques. Principals and participants in 51 percent of districts, and instructional leadership is a topic for 46 percent (Table 7).

43 percent of these districts use Chapter 2 to support retraining of teachers in areas in which they do not have the proper qualification. The most frequent areas for such retraining are computer literacy (32 percent of districts that use Chapter 2 for staff development) and mathematics or science (14 percent).

25 percent use the funds for *curriculum or new-program development*.

The most common areas for program development are reading or writing (42 percent of these districts) and computer literacy (37 percent). (See Table 8.)

16 percent provide *instructional services* under their grants.

Basic skills are the focus for most of these districts, and the economically or educationally disadvantaged receive instructional services in 42 percent of them (Table 9).

15 percent provide *student support services* such as counseling, assessment, or droput prevention.

General-purpose guidance and counseling is supported in 62 percent of these districts; services seldom focus on any student group in particular.

Across all types of districts and all uses of the funds, it is very common for the Chapter 2 grant to provide only partial support for activities. It sometimes functions as seed money to help a district initiate a program, and it is often combined with regular district funds or funds from other special programs.

Furthermore, Chapter 2 is often spread across several uses and across all schools or all types of students. Over the first three years of the program, districts were less and less inclined to concentrate the funds on any one type of purchase or activity.

SERVICES FOR STUDENTS WHO ATTEND PRIVATE SCHOOLS

About 42 percent of all school districts have private schools within their boundaries whose students are eligible to participate in Chapter 2. We found the following patterns of participation:

Overall, 75 percent of these districts serve students who attend at least some of the eligible private schools.

In the average district, about two-thirds of eligible private schools choose to have their students participate.

Although 80 percent of districts with eligible private schools report no change in participation since the antecedent programs, 18 percent report an increase. Data from private schools indicate that the availability of more funds, more perceived flexibility, and less perceived administrative complexity were factors prompting this increase in participation.

Reasons for nonparticipation include philosophical opposition to government programs or the small amount of money available under Chapter 2.

Although districts overwhelmingly spend the same amount per pupil on services for public and private school students, the uses of the funds are somewhat different:

In virtually all districts serving private school students (92 percent), Chapter 2 funds purchase instructional materials and equipment for these students. Purchases include computer hardware or software in two-thirds of these districts. Other uses of the funds are far less common (Table 10).

LOCAL DECISIONMAKING AND ADMINISTRATION

Our study gathered data on local decisionmaking under Chapter 2, including the ways in which parents and citizens participate.

Typically, one or a few district-level administrators control decisions about spending. Decisionmakers are often the Chapter 2 coordinator, the superintendent, or a committee in the central office. School staff, school boards, and communities tend to have little influence.

Chapter 2 decisions are commonly part of an ongoing process of making decisions about special programs or the district's overall educational program. For example, a curriculum planning group or the superintendent's cabinet is often involved. Community involvement may take place through consultation with an existing citizen advisory group.

On the whole, parents and citizens have not sought an active role in Chapter 2 decisions, and districts have not used many mechanisms to try to involve parents—although exceptions exist. Parent involvement is much more often indirect and is evident in decisions such as responding to community pressure for more computers in the schools.

The Chapter 2 law says the program is intended to be used flexibly to meet local needs, and local staff do indeed perceive that they have flexibility in decisionmaking:

District staff do not find that the federal government or state education agencies influence their use of the funds. In fact, fewer than 10 percent of districts report that they are using Chapter 2 to address statewide or national goals for educational reform.

Our case studies indicate, however, that the list of antecedent programs that appears on Chapter 2 applications may influence some local decisions by spelling out a selection of allowable uses for the funds.

Most Chapter 2 coordinators report little administrative burden associated with the program:

In only one instance does a majority of the districts in a size category report that a task is "somewhat" or "very" burdensome: this degree of burden is reported in very large districts with respect to their interactions with private schools. Otherwise, the perceived burden is light (Table 11).

Experience with other categorical programs has accustomed program administrators to the routines of preparing applications and demonstrating compliance with program requirements; these activities are seldom viewed as onerous.

For most districts, other than the largest, evaluation and reporting activities are minimal. Evaluation typically consists of gathering informal feedback on Chapter 2 purchases and activities (in 88 percent of districts) and collecting simple statistics on purchases or participants (in 42 percent).

TABLE 1.—AVERAGE (MEDIAN) AMOUNT OF DISTRICT CHAPTER 2 FUNDS PER PUPIL, BY DISTRICT SIZE

District size (enrollment)	Median amount of 1984-85 district funds per pupil	Percentage of students nationwide	Percentage of national chapter 2 funding
Very large (25,000 or more)	$8.19	26	32
Urban	9.19	16	22
Suburban	7.63	10	10
Large (10,000-24,999)	7.16	17	16
Medium (2,500 to 9,999)	6.85	35	30
Small (600 to 2,499)	7.42	18	17
Very small (under 600)	8.96	4	6
Total	$7.89	100	100

TABLE 2.—DISTRICTS THAT LOST AND GAINED FUNDING UNDER CHAPTER 2, BY DISTRICT SIZE

District size (enrollment)	Percentage of districts that had—						
	Greater than 75 percent gain	26–75 percent gain	5–25 percent gain	Little loss or gain	5–25 percent loss	26–75 percent loss	Greater than 75 percent loss
Very large (25,000 or more)	[1] 32	12	8	5	15	23	6
Urban	26	11	8	3	13	29	11
Suburban	40	12	8	7	17	15	0
Large (10,000–24,999)	47	15	8	3	6	18	3
Medium (2,500 to 9,999)	50	19	5	4	5	14	4
Small (600 to 2,499)	51	20	8	3	4	13	2
Very small (under 600)	52	11	10	6	3	10	8
All districts	51	16	9	4	4	12	5

[1] Rows may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding error.

TABLE 3.—AVERAGE FUNDING FROM ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS (1981–82) AND CHAPTER 2 (1982–83), BY SIZE OF DISTRICT

District size (enrollment)	Median antecedent funds (1981–82)	Median chapter 2 funds [1] (1982–83)	Percent change
Very large (25,000 or more)	$352,481	$382,716	+9
Urban	543,923	433,100	−20
Suburban	250,281	329,171	+32
Large (10,000–24,999)	70,737	94,233	+33
Medium (2,500–9,999)	17,617	28,410	+61
Small (600–2,499)	4,946	8,841	+79
Very small (under 600)	1,399	1,972	+41
All districts	4,706	6,532	+39

[1] Including both formula and state discretionary funds.

TABLE 4.—CHAPTER 2 EXPENDITURES IN DIFFERENT ACTIVITY AREAS

[Percentage of districts in each size category indicating that 1984–85 Chapter 2 funds are spent in each area]

District size (enrollment)	Computer applications	Support for library/media centers, other school departments [1]	Curriculum and new program development	Student support services	Instructional services	Staff development
Very large (25,000 or more)	85	86	56	52	54	79
Urban	85	86	50	54	62	83
Suburban	87	85	62	49	44	73
Large (10,000–24,999)	82	82	49	42	36	68
Medium (2,500–9,999)	78	71	33	22	25	40
Small (600–2,499)	80	64	25	17	12	27
Very small (less than 600)	62	68	18	7	13	16
All districts	72	68	25	15	16	27

[1] Including instructional materials and equipment other than computer hardware or software.

TABLE 5.—HOW LOCAL BLOCK GRANT FUNDS ARE DIVIDED AMONG THE MAJOR TYPES OF EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES THEY SUPPORT

Type of activities	Percentage of local funds allocated to activity in 1984-85	Total local expenditures with 1984-85 Chapter 2 funds [1]
Computer applications	30	$98,757,904
Library/media center support	29	96,682,360
Curriculum or new program development	9	30,055,895
Student support services	8	24,913,887
Instructional services	8	26,636,991
Staff development	9	28,657,702
Other [1]	7	24,680,265
Total	100	[2] 330,385,003

[1] Includes community education, minigrants, administration, evaluation, and miscellaneous uses that do not fit into the previous categories. See table III-4.

[2] This total reflects expenditures made or projected, as of the time of responding to the questionnaire in February to March 1985, from both formula and discretionary sources. It is less than the figure in Section II for "total amount of chapter 2 funds available to LEAs", because it does not include the private school share.

TABLE 6.—HOW CHAPTER 2-SUPPORTED COMPUTERS ARE USED: CURRICULAR AREAS AND TYPES OF USE

Among districts that put 1984-85 Chapter 2 funds into computer applications, percentage using the computers for—			
Curricular area		Type of use	
Mathematics	70	Drill and practice in noncomputer courses	68
Reading/writing/language	64	Computer literacy programming courses	68
Computer literacy	61	Teaching tool in noncomputer courses (other than for drill and practice)	67
Basic skills	58	Instructional management	67
Business education	35	Administrative applications	15
Science	34	Local software development	10
Vocational/career eduction	25		
Social studies/history	24		
Arts/music	11		
Foreign laguage	8		
ESL/bilingual (12) [1]	3		

[1] Percentage of districts based only on those with populations of Hispanic students (a rough proxy for districts with a need for ESL/bilingual services; however, we had no measure for other populations, e.g., Southeast Asian, that might need these services). This percentage increases as the percentage of Hispanic students goes up: 32 percent of the districts with more than 20 percent of the student population Hispanic used computers for ESL/bilingual programs.

TABLE 7.—PURPOSES AND CURRICULAR AREAS FOR CHAPTER 2-SUPPORTED STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

Among districts using 1984-85 chapter 2 funds for staff development. percentage that supported each purpose or curricular area	Purposes of staff development activity	Curricular areas	
Teaching techniques	77	Reading/writing language	64
Instructional leadership	46	Computer literacy	41
Subject areas	40	Mathematics	40
General administration	26	Basic skills	36
Needs of special populations	24	Social studies/history	30
Discipline and safety	22	Science	29
Interpersonal skills	20	Physical education	13
Intergroup relations	10	Health	12

TABLE 7.—PURPOSES AND CURRICULAR AREAS FOR CHAPTER 2-SUPPORTED STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY—Continued

Among districts using 1984-85 chapter 2 funds for staff development, percentage that supported each purpose or curricular area	Purposes of staff development activity	Curricular areas	
Student problem areas	9	Foreign language	12
		Vocational/career education	11
		Arts/music	11
		Business education	10
		ESL/bilingual (11) [1]	6
		Multicultural awareness (43) [2]	4

[1] Percentage based on districts with Hispanic student populations, to indicate one type of district likely to have limited-English-proficient (LEP) students. (We had no measure for other types of LEP subgroups.)

[2] Percentage based on districts implementing a desegregration plan in the last 5 years and using Chapter 2 for staff development.

TABLE 8.—*Areas in which Chapter 2 supports curriculum development*

[Among districts using 1984-85 Chapter 2 funds for curriculum development, the percentage that supported each of the indicated curricular areas]

Reading/writing	42
Computer literacy	37
Basic skills	25
Science	24
Vocational education	24
Mathematics	23
Social studies	21
Business education	19
Foreign language	11
Multicultural awareness (47) [1]	4
Health	9
Arts/music	8
Physical education	5
ESL/bilingual (17) [2]	4

[1] Percentage based on districts implementing a desegregation plan in the last 5 years and using Chapter 2 for curriculum development.

[2] Percentage based on districts with Hispanic student populations, to indicate one type of district likely to have limited-English-proficient (LEP) students. (We had no measure for other types of LEP subgroups.) This percentage decreases, however, as the concentration of Hispanic students increases; only 2 percent of the districts with student populations that are more than 20 percent Hispanic develop curricula in the ESL/bilingual areas.

TABLE 9.—CURRICULAR AREAS AND TARGET GROUPS INVOLVED IN CHAPTER 2-SUPPORTED INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES

Percentage of all districts using 1984-85 Chapter 2 funds for instructional services that focused the services on each curricular area or target group			
Curricular area		Target group	
Basic skills	65	Economic/education	42
Reading	62	Handicapped	27
Math	46	Average students	26
Social studies/history	22	Gifed and talented	20
Science	22	Limited English proficient (29) [1]	15
Computer literacy	19	Dropouts	9
Vocational/Career Education	17	Desegregated students	4
Arts/music	14		
ESL/bilingual	9		
Business education	8		
Health	6		
Physical education	5		
Multicultural awareness (45) [2]	5		

TABLE 9.—CURRICULAR AREAS AND TARGET GROUPS INVOLVED IN CHAPTER 2-SUPPORTED INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES—Continued

Percentage of all districts using 1984–85 Chapter 2 funds for instructional services that focused the services on each curricular area or target group			
Curricular area		Target group	
Foreign language	4		

[1] Percentage based on districts with Hispanic subpopulations, to demonstrate the incidence of this curricular emphasis in one type of district likely to serve limited-English-proficient students. This percentage increases with the concentration of Hispanic students: 38 percent of districts with more than 20 percent of their students Hispanic aimed Chapter 2 at LEP students.

[2] Percentage based on districts that have implemented a desegregation plan in the last 5 years and are using Chapter 2 funds for instructional services.

TABLE 10.—CHAPTER 2-SERVICES TO PRIVATE SCHOOL STUDENTS, BY SIZE OF DISTRICT

District sizxe (enrollment)	Percentage of Districts[1] in which each activity has been supported by Chapter 2 funds in the last 3 years for private school students—					
	Computer applications	Library/media center support	Curriculum, or new program development	Staff development	Instructional services	Student support services
Very large (25,000 or more)	84	100	22	30	16	6
Urban	85	100	23	39	15	5
Suburban	80	100	17	11	20	9
Large (10,000–24,999)	83	95	21	16	12	10
Medium (2,500–9,999)	64	91	20	14	9	7
Small (600–2,499)	66	91	24	6	6	4
All districts (600 or more)	68	92	22	11	9	6

[1] Among districts with one or more private schools with students participating in Chapter 2, and in which the private school students components is administered at the district level.

TABLE 11.—DEGREE OF BURDEN ASSOCIATED WITH PARTICULAR ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS UNDER THE BLOCK GRANT, BY SIZE OF DISTRICT

[Percentage of districts indicating that the following tasks were "somewhat" or "very burdensome" under Chapter 2]

District size (enrollment)	Planning for programs/purchases	Performing needs assessments	Applying for funds	Supervising programs/purchases	Accounting for expenditures	Reporting to state agencies	Evaluating the use of funds	Administering private school services[1]	Consultation with parents
Very large (25,000 or more)	32	34	23	44	45	27	35	60	28
Urban	33	36	25	46	48	32	29	66	23
Suburban	31	31	20	42	42	22	42	54	34
Large (10,000–24,999)	40	35	19	47	42	24	37	44	31
Medium (2,500–9,999)	23	34	20	25	31	30	34	40	26
Small (600–2,499)	22	39	18	29	34	36	34	39	24
Very small (less than 600)	15	35	13	11	8	22	21	32	26
All districts	20	36	17	22	23	29	29	40	25

[1] Percentage of those districts with participating private schools only.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Dr. Turnbull.

The next and final witness is Mr. Ron Atwood, Senior Administrator for Project Development, Orange County Public Schools, Orlando, Florida.

STATEMENT OF MR. RON ATWOOD, SENIOR ADMINISTRATOR FOR PROJECT DEVELOPMENT, ORANGE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS, ORLANDO, FL

Mr. ATWOOD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Ron Atwood. I am Senior Administrator, Project Development Services, Orange County Public Schools, Orlando, FL.

As of September 1986, we are the 25th largest school district in the country. The district has a K-through-12 enrollment of approximately 84,000 students. Last year our Chapter 2 funding was $732,000. One of my principal job responsibilities is to write and administer the district's ECIA chapter program.

When Andy Hartman, Congressman Goodling's aide, called me on Tuesday afternoon, I was at a meeting with the district's Chapter 2 advisory committee. Andy asked me to describe how Chapter 2 works in my district, how we use funds, and how Chapter 2 addresses and meets local needs.

I reported my conversation to the committee, and they were very pleased. They strongly believe that Chapter 2 is meeting the needs of our district, needs which they have helped to identify and programs that they have helped to shape. It was a very proud moment for them.

I would like to focus today on how Chapter 2 meets the needs of my school district. I have included two handouts for the committee members. One is an action plan that describes the sequence of events that I follow in order to meet all the requirements of the legislation, and the other handout is a proposed—is the proposed spending for next year, 1987-88, although that will be modified, more than likely, in the next month and a half.

The legislation requires systematic consultation with parents and children attending the district's elementary and secondary schools, teachers and administrators of those schools, nonpublic school officials, and other necessary groups. As I say, the action plan is my way of keeping myself on track.

The advisory committee consists of nine persons, two teachers, two administrators, four parents, and a representative from the nonpublic schools. The committee is my primary vehicle for parent and teacher input. I meet with them at least twice a year, once in January or February to report project progress, and then in March to plan the next year's application.

To measure the extent of their input, I look back at the very first Chapter 2 application that we prepared back in 1982. We had a total of eight projects, three of which were carryovers from previous ESEA programs. In our very first meeting in 1982, the committee stated that they felt Chapter 2 should not be solely for the purpose of continuing previous programs. Now, five years later, as I look at our proposed application, five of those funded in 1982 are no longer on the list. In fact, most have been integrated into ongoing district programs. They met the needs in 1982, and they continue to meet our needs in 1987.

In that first application, the committee also supported the concept of a districtwide grant competition, which became our superintendent's competitive grant program. We have an annual competition. Schools and units write proposals based on their identified needs. Reading committees consisting of teachers, administrators, and community persons read and score the applications. Those applications with the highest are recommended to the superintendent for funding.

To date, we have had over 200 applications submitted by our schools and work units covering all major areas, math, science, foreign language, reading, basic instruction, innovative approaches to meeting local needs. We have funded 109 grants.

Many of the programs funded under the superintendent's competitive grant program were very successful at the schools. We needed some kind of a way to let other schools use these programs. In 1984 I discussed this concept with the committee. They formed a subcommittee to work with our staff to develop an adoption program for the 1985-86 fiscal year. This was called a sharing success program, the mechanism by which schools and units can adopt and in a sense field-test programs that have been successful at other locations. To date, we have had two cycles of sharing success and 38 projects have been funded.

The action plan shows further that I meet with our division staff, the associate superintendents, and the deputy superintendent of our instructional units to review the application with them, and to add components they feel are essential. We hold a public hearing for citizen input, and finally we bring the application before our school board for their approval.

We also meet with our nonpublic schools. We send them letters. We also advertise. We have them fill out a needs assessment statement, and based upon their needs, their role in Chapter 2 is determined for the next year.

I submit that Chapter 2 is a unique federal education program, because it gives us at the local level the flexibility to use the funds to meet needs deemed important by parents, teachers, administrators, and the community. I have seen a wide array of programs created and implemented. For example, two years ago one of our senior high schools wrote a superintendent's competitive grant for an international baccalaureate program. The grant request was $6,700.

These are a few of the objectives to improve students' standardized test performance on the SAT, the ACT, the ACH, and AP exams, through the institution of the international baccalaureate programs interdisciplinary curriculum; to improve writing skills; to increase the number of national merit semifinalists through increased practice in the necessary math and verbal skills; finally, to improve attendance of academically talented students by offering them challenging courses.

This application was reviewed by our readers, recommended to the superintendent, and funded. It began with 34 students. Before I got on the plane yesterday I called the principal of the high school. This year there are over 80 students in the program, which is now locally funded, for over $20,000, and at least two of other senior high schools want the program, and are doing what they can to get into it.

We developed a catalogue for our sharing success program. We presently have 10 program offerings in the catalogue, and it is growing every day. I recall a program to reduce student absenteeism, which began with a $5000 grant to one of our schools. Now it is in every one of our 10 senior high schools. We have one of three management academies in the State of Florida, thanks to Chapter 2.

Finally, next year we are proposing an in-service program for secondary mathematics teachers, to be called mathematics modelling. I am very interested in this one. It is one of the few times we have been able to work with a university. We are recommending that it be funded for $5000. If it is successful, and I believe it will be, the university will apply to the National Science Foundation for a grant to expand the program to include not only Orange County, but many other counties as well.

Chapter 2 began as a federal effort to permit local school districts the means to meet local needs. It works in Orange County. It gives creative minds the opportunity and resources to create. The Orange County public schools supports a continuation of Chapter 2 in its present form. Other federal programs are designated for target groups. We ask that Chapter 2 continue to allow districts to exercise their discretion in the operation of its programs.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Ron Atwood follows:]

STATEMENT OF RON ATWOOD, SENIOR ADMINISTRATOR, PROJECT DEVELOPMENT SERVICES, ORANGE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS, ORLANDO, FL

My name is Ron Atwood. I am Senior Administrator, Project Development Services, Orange County Public Schools, Orlando, Florida. As of September, 1986, the district has a K-12 enrollment of over 84,000 students. We are the 25th largest school district in the country. Our ECIA Chapter Two funding last year was $732,000, a reduction of some $60,000 from the previous year. One of my principal job responsibilities is to write and administer the district's ECIA Chapter Two Program.

When Andy Hartman, Congressman Goodling's aide, called me on Tuesday afternoon I was at a meeting with the district's Chapter Two Advisory Committee. Andy asked me to describe how Chapter Two works in my district—how we use the funds and how Chapter Two addresses and meets local needs. I reported my conversation with Andy to them, and they were very pleased. They strongly believe that Chapter Two is meeting the needs of our district, needs which they have helped identify and programs that they have helped to shape. It was a proud moment for them.

MEETING LOCAL NEEDS

I would like to focus today on how Chapter Two meets the needs of my school district. To begin I have a handout for each committee member. It is a copy of the Chapter Two Application Action Plan for 1987-1988. The legislation requires systematic consultation with parents of children attending the district's elementary and secondary schools, teachers and administrators of those schools, nonpublic school officials and other necessary groups. The action plan is my way of staying on track in meeting all of these requirements and in keeping my attention on meeting local needs.

The advisory committee consists of nine persons: two teachers, two administrators, four parents, and a representative from the nonpublic schools. The committee is my primary vehicle for parent and teacher input. I meet with them at least twice a year—in January or early February to report project progress, and in March to plan the next year's application. To measure the extent of their input I looked at the very first Chapter Two application that we prepared back in 1982. We had a total of eight projects—three of which were carryovers from previous ESEA programs. In our very first meeting in 1982 the committee stated that they felt Chapter Two should not be solely for the purpose of continuing previous programs. Now, five years later, as I look at our proposed application five of those funded in 1982 are no longer on the list. Most have been integrated into ongoing district programs. They met the needs in 1982, and they continue to meet the needs in 1987. In that first application the committee also supported the concept of a district-wide grant competition which became our Superintendent's Competitive Grant Program. We have an annual competition. Schools and units write proposals based on their identified needs. Reading committees consisting of teachers, administrators and community persons read and score the applications. Those applications with the highest scores are recommended to the Superintendent for funding. To date, we have had over 200 applications submitted by our schools and work units covering all major areas—math, science, foreign language, reading—innovative approaches to meeting local needs. We have funded 109 grants.

Many of the programs funded under the Superintendent's Competitive Grant Program were successfully implemented at the schools and work sites. Was there a way for all of our schools to have access to these programs? In 1984 I discussed this concept with the committee. They formed a subcommittee to work with our staff to develop an adoption program for the 1985-86 fiscal year. This was called the Sharing Success Program, the mechanism by which schools and units can adopt and field test programs that have been successful at other locations. To date, we have had two cycles of the Sharing Success Program—38 projects have been funded.

The action plan further shows that I meet with our division staff (the associate superintendents and deputy superintendent of our instructional units) to review the application with them and to add components they feel are essential. We hold a public hearing for citizen input, and finally we bring the application before our School Board for their approval.

IMPACT ON OUR DISTRICT

I submit that Chapter Two is a unique federal education program because it gives us at the local level the flexibility to use the funds to meet the needs deemed important by parents, teachers, administrators and the community. I have seen a wide array of programs created and implemented. For example two years ago one of our senior high schools wrote a Superintendents Competitive Grant for an International Baccalaureate Program for $6,700. These were some of the objectives of that project:

Improve student's standardized test performance on the SAT, the ACT, the ACH and the AP exams through the International Baccalaureate Program's interdisciplinary curriculum;

Improve student writing skills through the use of computer based writing tutorials.

Increase the number of National Merit Semi-finalists through increased practice in the necessary math and verbal skills;

Improve attendance of academically talented students by offering challenging courses.

It began with 34 students. This year over 80 students are in the program, which is now locally funded for over $20,000, and at least two other district senior high schools want the program for their students.

We developed a catalog for our Sharing Success Program. We presently have ten programs in the catalog and it is growing every day because teachers and principals know that these projects will meet their needs. I recall a program to reduce student absenteeism which began with a $5,000 Superintendent's Competitive Grant—now it is in all our secondary schools. We have one of three management academies in the State of Florida thanks to Chapter Two. Finally, next year we are proposing an inservice program for secondary mathematics teachers to be called mathematics modeling. We are recommending that it be funded for $5,000. If this program is successful, we anticipate that the university with which we will be working will apply for a National Science Foundation Grant to expand the program to include not only Orange County but many surrounding counties as well.

Chapter Two began as a federal effort to permit local school districts the means to meet local needs. It works in Orange County. It gives creative minds the opportunity and resources to create. The Orange County Public Schools supports the continuation of Chapter Two in its present form. Other federal programs are designated for targeted groups—let districts continue to exercise their discretion in the operation of Chapter Two.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Atwood.

Mr. Atwood, you indicated that the advisory committee which you had organized consisted of nine persons, including four parents. How are the parents selected?

Mr. ATWOOD. We have a large school district, Mr. Hawkins, and when I first started the committee, I went to our volunteer component. Also I went to the PTA and talked with the representatives from those units. They recommended parents to me. I wrote letters to the parents, they responded, and they joined my committee.

I have had a turnover of about two parents in the last four years, and with the teachers I have had a turnover of three, so I am getting new blood pretty consistently.

Chairman **Hawkins**. Thank you.

Mr. Tirozzi, the Chair has had an opportunity to visit Connecticut and to observe the manner in which the state has implemented the effective schools concept, and I wish to certainly commend you. I think, in terms of the development of that concept, the state stands out as one of the real fine exemplary states in terms of the manner in which you have done it, and I certainly wish to use this occasion to commend you on what you have been able to do.

Mr. **Tirozzi**. Thank you.

Chairman **Hawkins**. With respect to your testimony, there were several points in connection with it that I was not exactly clear on. One of the principles that you stated was the question of the principle of concentration, so as to serve the neediest. That concept is being discussed before this committee currently, and a casual reading of some of the provisions in the current law seem to indicate that the law already requires a concentration of efforts and a serving of the neediest students at the local district, and that that monitoring and supervision is placed in the department in the states through the state educational agency as well as the bedrock responsibility still being retained by the Department of Education.

And yet we constantly talk about concentrating on the neediest. Are you suggesting that we cannot use current law to do it, or that somehow the law must be changed in order to do it; or is it a question that local educational agencies are not doing it at the present, and if not, why is it that the states which have the supervision of local educational agencies cannot in some way compel them to do it and enforce them—I am not suggesting that they are not, I am simply saying that that criticism has been made.

And what is your opinion of whether or not the law as currently—the law currently requires it to be done, or is it true that most local educational agencies are already doing it?

Mr. **Tirozzi**. I think the major issue—you probably heard this before, but I do have to say it—there simply is not enough money to address the problem and the magnitude of the problem. If you go into an urban school district where 80 percent of the youngsters are on some form of AFDC, and on any assessment program we have, a good percentage of those youngsters are below the standards we would like, and we try to make every effort to reach out and touch as many of those youngsters as we possibly can.

We use the same concept that was—as we look across the state, regardless of where a youngster lives, if they have this type of a need, we want to serve the need. And yet, you know, having worked in an urban district myself and been principal of an urban school, a middle school and an elementary school, where you have large pockets of poverty, and you have schools where 90 percent of the students, 80 percent, 70 percent, are on some form of AFDC, or the district, like Hartford, which is just about 90 percent, you really need to treat that problem in a different way, because it is magnified.

And on the one hand, I mean, there is a political question here. You want to serve as many youngsters as you can, you want to reach out as far as you can, but ultimately you simply do not have enough dollars to really impact on particular schools or particular districts with the very high concentration. That is why, in terms of reauthorization, if consideration is given, my own personal view would be, hopefully, it would not be to look at the pot of money and make it more categorical, which would mean, in some states, we are going to lose a number of children we can serve.

I think somehow it has to be—the cost of living has to be factored in, and then on top of that we have to look at a sum of money where we can really look at some programs that could be pilots or magnets, you know, in particular, I think, the effective schools and the target-school concept would work very nicely with flexibility you have heard, I think, just about every one of us talk about.

But I just think there is not enough money to address the issue of concentration.

Chairman HAWKINS. Well, of course, the argument is made by those who feel that some of us are advocating more liberal treatment and trying to obtain additional money that we—that the schools are not doing the best job of concentrating on the neediest. And if they did that, then obviously the neediest would be better served, and consequently the money would be more effectively used.

They use that as the excuse for the cutbacks. Now, assuming that a school, let us say, a school district has, let us say, 20 schools. Could they not, let us say, rank the schools in the order of need based on the income, whether they use AFDC or the school lunch program, could flexibly be a choice that they would make. But once having used that, cannot they rank, let us say, the five schools that are concentrated in the areas of the low-income group are the poorest schools in terms of income, now, in among those 20, and those first five ranked in that order would be the ones that would be served; so that if you do not have enough money to reach 20 school districts, so you select the number——

Mr. TIROZZI. Yeah.

Chairman HAWKINS. According to the amount of money which obviously does not reach everybody, but at least it complies with the provision that you are concentrating on the neediest. Could you not, let us say, after you have ranked the schools in that order, then start at the bottom, reach the first five; if you get additional money you could go six, seven, et cetera, which is pretty much what the current law would—is predicated on that ranking and the use of that money.

Now, obviously, we do not have enough money to reach more than, as you indicated, 35 or 40 percent of the eligible students, but at least you'll be reaching the neediest. What is wrong with doing that? Why can't that be done, and would that not be in compliance with what the law requires?

Mr. TIROZZI. It probably would stand the test of compliance. The concern I would have, and I think the concern you would hear from local superintendents and local board members and probably commissioners of education—I will use Hartford, Connecticut, as an example, where about 90 percent of the youngsters are on some form of AFDC, you could rank. I would say where you have high pockets of concentration within the city, within the school, it is—I would not really want to be the judge to say that because *X* school has a greater concentration, there are not significant needs in School Y, especially when you look at the problems which many of these youngsters are in fact bringing to school.

Also, I think the way the program is structured initially, there was a major attempt made by school districts to try to reach out and spread the wealth, if I may use that phrase, and I think many, many school districts and many states now are trying very hard to do that. But at the same time, as we move forward, we are beginning to recognize more clearly where you find these very, very high concentrations—Hartford, from the state perspective we probably should be putting a lot more money, Chapter 1 money, into Hartford at the expense of a number of districts where they have a much smaller percentage of youngsters in need.

But there is a major, at the moment, political consideration in terms of doing that with parents, small P, political—well, large and small P, with parents, with politicians, with school board members, with superintendents, and so on.

I would just give you an example of where I think it has worked in reverse. We have a very unique program in Connecticut where we have up front publicly identified the 20 lowest-scoring districts in the state, and we put the money there in this grant. And all grant programs in the state of Connecticut allow a certain percentage automatically to go to those districts. That was stated up front, everyone expected it, it is our effort at concentration.

I think with the federal money, and over time, Chapter 1 20 years old, there has been this attempt to spread the wealth as much as possible, and I think it would be very difficult for a school district like Hartford to say, here are five schools that they rank the poorest, when in fact if you look at all the other schools, they are so close to that ranking, I am not certain you really are—you are really forgetting a significant portion of the population. Really what you need is lot of—larger pot of money so you can impact on all of those children.

Chairman HAWKINS. You have made reference to a meeting which—that you had with the Catholic Conference, and the sharing of views with them, including the discussion of the voucher system. The committee, as you well know, in its proposal has an earmarked amount for the nonpublic schools. However, before this committee a few days ago—I guess it was the week after—week before last—the Catholic bishop, Bishop Hughes, did not only support the idea of the earmarked money, which he felt was acceptable; however, he also included by implication some support for a voucher system.

Now, in the accommodation which we thought that we had with the views expressed that we would not be faced with the problem of the public versus the nonpublic school people sharing money or taking money away from the public schools is the reason we earmarked a specific amount. Did—were you of the opinion that the Catholic Conference was advocating both, both the voucher system as well as earmarking of money? Because, in a sense, both are not likely to happen; it is going to be one or the other, and it just seems to me that you are not going to be able to really have your choice. It is going to be difficult to get money for anything, as you well know, at this session, and to get the $30 million earmarked, and I agree with you that it would be great if we could get more than that. We are not so sure we are going to get that amount, but let us assume we get as much as we possibly can, and that it is in the neighborhood of $30 million. Is it your impression that your accommodation with them is that they are pushing for both, or are they—have they decided that we are going to be practical, pragmatic, and go for what is something tangible?

Or am I asking you for an opinion that you would not want to state?

Mr. TIROZZI. No, I think I can address the question, very carefully; I do not want to speak for the Catholic bishops.

Chairman HAWKINS. I just want to know what was your impression.

Mr. TIROZZI. It was interesting, the conversation we had with that group. The subject of vouchers lasted all of 30 seconds. We made our position very clear. They fully understood that would be our position, and they did not push it.

We had a very lengthy discussion as to how we could work together to ensure that money was set aside to meet the needs of implementing the Felton decision, and I——

Chairman HAWKINS. You have no problem with supporting the earmarking of the money, then?

Mr. TIROZZI. It has to be additional money; it cannot be—we would not—I do not support it off the top.

Chairman HAWKINS. Yeah, as additional money, you would have no problem with it?

Mr. TIROZZI. No; one-time funding, because my sense is districts could move aggressively to implement, and I like the carryover because it does give them a——

Chairman HAWKINS. But you would oppose it if it meant taking the money away from the public school system?

Mr. TIROZZI. Yes.

Chairman. HAWKINS. I see. That is clear enough.

You made some reference to Detroit, how Detroit—you were quoting, as I understand, someone else—would not qualify at the 75 percent level. It would—sounds a little unbelievable, almost, to us. I wonder if you could verify that and inform the committee, because we had somewhat the same problem in the Los Angeles unified school district, and it is my understanding that they—that the state was under a misapprehension about it and that the Los Angeles unified school district, did qualify at the 75 percent level, and I am surprised that Detroit would not qualify also.

You said no school, as I understand it, in quoting——

Mr. TIROZZI. I am repeating——

Chairman HAWKINS [continuing]. That no school in Detroit would qualify, and what I am asking you to do is to verify whether or not that is actually true, so that the committee would at least understand whether or not their 75 percent is a very unrealistic cutoff figure.

Mr. TIROZZI. We want very much to do that. That is why I suggested, I think, we do need more time before we talk about a specific percentage. But yes, we can talk to Mr. Runkle in Michigan and document that for you.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you.

Mr. Bartlett, I think you are the ranking member, are you not? Oh, Mr. Goodling——

Mr. BARTLETT. With the notable exception of Mr. Goddling.

Chairman HAWKINS. I did not know Mr. Goodling had returned. Mr. Goodling, would you——

Mr. GOODLING. Just one question. I just got all shook up. Of course, I have been all shook up over in the Budget Committee meeting. Unfortunately, the cameras are there and we are not accomplishing anything except hurling barbs back and forth.

But I just came back, and think I heard someone say that the chiefs may be supporting IEPs in a Chapter 1 program?

Mr. TIROZZI. I do not believe that was in our testimony today.

Mr. GOODLING. No. I just thought I would ask you, because apparently the rumor has come from some others that that may be a possibility, and I cannot believe that that could possibly be.

Mr. TIROZZI. No. Well, in fairness, I can speak to that. The chiefs are in fact, you know—I want to phrase this carefully, because you get different views from different chiefs. I do not believe there has been an official position.

David Hornbeck very emphatically would like to move in this direction. We have spoken, and in a discussion we had with the advocacy groups, in principle we support the IEP, because ultimately that is a direction we should move.

However, I think, if that is going to take place at some time, we have to absolutely ensure that we allow time to build process. We have to be very careful that it does not look like the special education system, because we could end up in a morass or a bureaucracy of hearings and so on, and ultimately, if the bottom line is to serve children and all our attention is diverted to process, I am always concerned about that issue.

But without question, I have been delighted to hear from the chiefs, several of them, that the concept, without question, would be supported, and I would think at some point that could be an official position.

But I do not think—I stand to be corrected—I do not think——

Mr. GOODLING. Do the chiefs ever talk with the people who are actually there in the classroom or the administrators directly affected by all of this? We are not talking about individualized instruction which is not the way Chapter 1 works. Chapter 1 deals on an individual basis in a group setting.

Now, I cannot for the life of me believe that you could take a special education IEP program and somehow make that work in a Chapter 1 setting. I would agree with the last thing you said; you will spend most of your time in litigation. We will never get around to serving children.

Mr. TIROZZI. Mr. Goodling, if I may, I tried to say that we should not take the model of special ed and try to transplant it. The concept of an individual education program for youngsters, it seems to me, at some point as we move youngsters through the grades and we continue to experience failure with many of these youngsters, especially poor youngsters, individuals have a responsibility to sit down and look at that individual progress and what programs that youngster needs to move ahead.

I think we can borrow from the model in special ed, but I am suggesting—and this is my personal view—I think it is going to be a serious problem if we just try to take the model and move it. I think, however, in terms of the administration of Chapter 1, the staff development component of Chapter 1, and even the parent involvement component of Chapter 1, there could be a methodology in place whereby we look at each youngster, especially those who have been in the program for a period of time and are not progressing. Parents have a right to know why, administrators who should be accountable as to why they are not progressing, and somehow we have to look at the individual child as a unit of analysis.

Mr. GOODLING. Each teacher and each administrator, I would hope, would be doing that. My first concern is you are talking about different types of parents. Secondly, our help with the parent in Chapter 1 may be far better if we are doing something with them in relationship to functional illiteracy and things of that nature.

When you look at the program as it is presently geared, then I think Mr. Hornbeck and others better make sure that we understand what it is they are talking about. All we are hearing is that he might, or he is supporting an IEP. Now, an IEP is an IEP at the present time; it is nothing else.

Mr. TIROZZI. I am not here to speak for David Hornbeck. David Hornbeck can speak for himself, and do it very well. This discussion has taken place. There is no position the chiefs have taken as to an IEP. There is nothing in our testimony that speaks to an IEP.

We have discussed it. We have discussed it with the advocacy groups, but again, there is no position.

I do think the concept—and you are right, you know, one could make the legitimate argument that ideally, put Chapter 1 aside. A good educational program should be predicated on individual educational needs of youngsters. We talk about that in all of our rhetoric; we should practice that, and somewhere down the road, I think, the major concern we have when we look at at-risk youth, at what point do we identify youngsters who, over time, are not progressing; what is the problem; and how do we look at the individual child and cause the child——

Mr. GOODLING. I call that an assessment.

Mr. TIROZZI. Well, fine. We have different——

Mr. GOODLING. I have no problems with doing a better job of assessing where we are and where we are going. However, a red flag starts waving when you say the IEP is the direction to go. I do not believe one truly understands what it is we are doing in Chapter 1, which is different than what we are doing in special ed.

Mr. TIROZZI. I fully agree with that, and we have—I personally have had serious problems, look at the model in special ed and suggesting it could be immediately transferred into Chapter 1. It would be a major issue. It would be a major problem. The resources would be difficult. You know, we are more and more writing strong teacher contracts which talk about limited time to confer with parents, confer with teachers, confer with administrators, and all of that would be a problem.

But the concept of looking at the individual child, and something we have talked about in all of our testimony this morning, I believe every speaker spoke very positively toward effective schools, and looking at the school as a unit of analysis. And I would be very supportive if we begin to look very seriously at that, because as the school improves, ideally a large number of children in the school are improving. And that, to me, could be a very good unit of analysis in terms of looking at direction and purpose for Chapter 1.

Mr. **Goodling**. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but I did not get much chance to speak over there in that hot air before the cameras on the Budget Committee, so I had to take it out over here, I guess.

Chairman **Hawkins**. Well, you certainly did.

Mr. Hayes.

Mr. **Hayes**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I must confess that my beginning the fourth year here, working with you and this committee, has done a lot to cause me to focus more attention on legislation as it impacts on my own district, which you might understand. I represent a district, as you well know, that encompasses an awful lot of disadvantaged, high-risk students. And I look at H.R. 5, School Improvement Act, and what Chapter 1 and 2 under the current educational program is doing to affect them.

I want to ask, particularly you, Dr. Terrell, the future outlook for a kid now in my district who is hungry after three weeks in the month, whose parent, or one parent, is on AFDC, and they do not eat till they go to school. Do you think these kids, although there may be some among them who could potentially become astronauts of the future, or something else that fits into our society, or engineer, do you not think there is an awful lot of creaming going on?

Under the current program, the funds that are distributed do not seem to me to reach these areas, or these schools in these areas. We do not have computers, which is what Chapter 2 would provide. How can we get to the point where these students can be considered as leaders of tomorrow rather than casualties of today and tomorrow? That is my question.

Dr. **Terrell**. I am glad you asked, Mr. Hayes.

I guess I would suggest that, if anything has occurred from my perspective of Chapter 2, is that it has suffered from its success, and the successes come in the form of—and I think we have heard testimony—of individual programs, some of them innovative, some of them creative, that work for small segments of the population. And I guess that probably is why I have come to advocate very strongly for some of the moneys in Chapter 2 being earmarked specifically to deal with the issue of effective schools, because those moneys, when invested in effective school programs, have schoolwide impact.

Most of the things that have occurred with Chapter 2 have dealt with small segments of the school, or a specific program in the school. The effective schools program will impact the totality of the school setting. And I think that is what makes it most viable, and if you will, you get more bang for the buck by putting your money and your efforts into that kind of a program that has far-reaching effects and can reach that kid and that group of kids that you are talking about, in terms of their future.

Mr. **Hayes**. Certainly there is creaming going on, though, I think.

Dr. **Terrell**. Essentially—well, yeah, the programs are, if you will, focused on narrower sections than schoolwide, yes.

Mr. **Hayes**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman **Hawkins**. Mr. Bartlett.

Mr. **Bartlett**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Turnbull, in reading through your very well prepared testimony and data that you provided to us, a couple of questions come to mind that I hope you could just clarify for us.

You told us that 72 percent of the districts use Chapter 2 money for computer applications, and then you had a Table 6 to back that up. I wonder if you could give us some indication, if you have the data, as to how they are using those computer applications. I am trying to get a sense as to whether use is focusing on instruction or focusing on other kinds of uses, or focusing only on computer literacy.

Dr. **Turnbull**. Most of it is being used in instruction. There are only a few districts that are using their computers for administrative purposes. So students working directly with the computers, or using a computer-based classroom management system is very common.

We found that basic skills, if you will, mathematics, reading, and so on, were the most common areas in which we found the computers used, but also a great many computer literacy courses being offered. So, again, the story is one of a good deal of variety.

But when we followed up on the use of computers, we did find that they were reported to be in use for most of the school day and school. They are used by all types of students, and they are used for academic purposes.

Mr. **Bartlett**. So you found a very strong emphasis on academics. Who is using the computers? For example, are handicapped students—do they have access to the computers, or are they——

Dr. **Turnbull**. Yes.

Mr. **Bartlett** [continuing]. Special application?

Dr. **Turnbull**. Yes. Most districts will say that all types of students are using the computers, but there are sizable numbers of districts which are focusing computer use on a particular group. It is the handicapped in some districts. It is quite often the gifted and talented also.

Mr. **Bartlett**. I have one other question on computer application. Are there needs in one area that outweigh others? Is there a greater need for software or is there a greater need for hardware, or is there a need for software development and dissemination in the instructional area.

Dr. **Turnbull**. Over time, we have seen that the districts have moved from hardware purchases toward somewhat more investment in software, staff training, working on, very often, a several-year plan for integrating the computers into their program. And that, I do not believe we asked specifically about what is needed next, but that seems to be a progression that districts tend to follow.

Mr. **Bartlett**. OK. I just want to make sure that I understand your statement on Page 2 of your testimony that 16 percent of Chapter 2 uses provide instructional services under their grants. You are suggesting that a large part of the 72 percent of the computer applications are also for instructional services, so 16 percent may be misleadingly low?

Dr. **Turnbull**. Oh, yes, I am glad you asked that. That is right. Those are cases where staff who provide instruction are funded out of Chapter 2, and in a great many districts that have these small grants, they have found that it is not worthwhile or effective to put the money into direct staff salaries. That is more common in the larger districts.

Mr. **Bartlett**. Thank you. You also indicate in your table regarding the use of the direct instructional grants, that some 29 percent of the school districts with large hispanic populations used those funds for bilingual—or for limited-English-proficient students. As you may know, I am an advocate for LEP students and for bilingual education. Can you give us some sense—with Chapter 2 there is total openness as far as choice of curriculum—as to what kind of curriculum is being chosen under the use of Chapter 2 for bilingual?

Dr. **Turnbull**. No, I am afraid we do not.

Mr. **Bartlett**. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. **Terrell**. Mr. Bartlett, if I——

Mr. **Bartlett**. Yes.

Dr. **Terrell** [continuing]. Just to comment on the instructional use of computers, I was involved in a bit of research that would tend to indicate that when dealing with poor and minority students, the instructional use of computers becomes, if you will, an electronic, frequently, electronic workbook or an electronic ditto, as opposed to when used with gifted, talented students learning computer programming or more sophisticated uses of computer.

So I am not sure that, while they are being used in instructional programs, particularly with poor and minority, that they are being used as effectively as they could be.

Mr. **Bartlett**. Do you believe that the effectiveness will increase naturally over the next five years? Do you see a large increase in the use of computers for instructional purposes?

Dr. **Terrell**. Not without a lot of training.

Mr. **Bartlett**. So in addition to software, you believe we must provide training to remove the fear factor of computers from teachers.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman **Hawkins**. Mr. Sawyer.

Mr. Solarz?

Mr. **Solarz**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me ask each of you if you could briefly recapitulate what specific changes, if any, you would like to see in Chapter 2 in relationship to what is provided for in H.R. 5.

Dr. **Terrell**. Single purpose, single focus, and single mission for my——

Mr. **Solarz**. Pardon?

Dr. **Terrell**. I have a single purpose, single focus, and single mission, from my perspective, and that is to see an expansion of the implementation of effective schools, only because I think that the impact that it has on a schoolwide basis is the best use of moneys, and therefore earmarking some of the money specifically for that thrust, I think, is important.

Mr. **Solarz**. How much would you earmark?

Dr. **Terrell**. Twenty percent.

Mr. **Solarz**. And how would that money be spent?

Dr. **Terrell**. I would use it as incentive grants to individual schoolsites administered from the state level to ensure that those programs were put in place.

Mr. **Solarz**. Sure that those programs were—what?

Dr. **Terrell**. That the effective school—that the activities of effective schools are funded directly to schoolsite levels.

Mr. **Solarz**. Well, from reading your testimony, I had the impression you were making the point that you can see improvements in specific schools that have large minority populations, but you have not seen any improvements in districts as a whole.

Dr. **Terrell**. That is correct.

Mr. **Solarz**. And I gather one of the points you were making, which seemed to me to make a lot of sense, was that if we could identify the schools where real improvements have taken place, and such schools exist in——

Dr. **Terrell**. Correct.

Mr. **Solarz** [continuing]. Many cities, communities, around the country, by identifying how those schools had succeeded. By letting school administrators and teachers elsewhere around the country know how those schools succeeded, it would presumably not only induce them to adopt similar strategies, but bring to their attention the critical information, which you seem to suggest they lack, about why the successful schools were successful.

Now, if that is the case, would it make sense to have a program as part of this Chapter 2, or somewhere else in the bill? Maybe one already exists, in which the Department of Education identifies the schools that had succeeded, and further identifies the factors that are responsible for their success with a view toward disseminating that information to administrators and educators around the country. In other words, is there a role for the federal government to play by way of identifying successful schools and disseminating information as to the reasons for their success?

Dr. **Terrell**. I think the process of identification and dissemination of the information has begun. I think what is needed, though, is a resource, if you will, a challenge grant to encourage a school then to move to do it. I think there is awareness of what these elements are, but I think in terms of getting it to the total teaching staff, have everybody in the school involved and understanding the process, there is a need for some resources to challenge, if you will, a particular school to move to implement those things at the schoolsite.

Mr. **Solarz**. How would such a challenge grant work?

Dr. **Terrell**. I think that school by school. A school that is identified that fits the descriptors of those that need improving could apply for moneys that would involve support, basically, in service, and some innovation. Flexibility would have to abide at the school level, but flexibility to move to implement the basic correlates of effective schools and to implement them at their schoolsite.

Mr. **Solarz**. And your notion is to have a setaside of funds from Chapter 2?

Dr. **Terrell**. For which, yes, for which schools could draw on to do that.

Mr. **Solarz**. Right, and is there a national consensus among educators as to what constitutes an effective school?

Dr. **Terrell**. In general terms, yes. They would also at the same time say that school by school within those general parameters there would be enough flexibility to deal with the particular verities of the local schoolsite.

Mr. **Solarz**. Do the rest of you have any other specific changes you would recommend, for Chapter 2?

Chairman **Hawkins**. If the Chair would—could ask the gentleman to yield, the Department of Education did identify effective schools in its book, What Works, and did support the concept. The challenge grants that were referred to were included in legislation passed by this committee last year, and the bill went to the Senate. The administration did not support—the Secretary of Education did not support the challenge grants, although he identified the effective school concept, and also indicated that it had been in operation in specific schools, so that we went that far towards the accomplishment of what you have indicated. However, the bill itself failed in the Senate, that is, it was never taken up in the Senate.

It is now included in the House bill, and will again be acted upon. I just thought that what you have described actually took place, but was not successful.

Mr. **Solarz**. Well, I thank the Chairman very much. As the Chairman knows, I am relatively new to this process, and I am always impressed by the wealth of his experience and knowledge of the history of these various initiatives.

Chairman **Hawkins**. No, I just wanted you to know, to have the satisfaction of having identified, really, the problem and the—and what actually should take place. However, we have not yet succeeded, and I am not criticizing the Senate for having, let us say, not having taken the bill up. But the committee did approve precisely what you were discussing in your colloquy.

Mr. **Solarz**. Well, I thank the Chairman for that. It does seem to me that if there is one role for the federal government in improving education in our country that virtually everybody could agree on, it would be identifying what works and disseminating that information throughout the country so that states and communities can get the benefit of the successful experience of other states and communities they otherwise might not know about.

But could the others briefly indicate if there are any specific changes they would recommend in current law or in H.R. 5 as it is drafted with respect to Chapter 2?

Mr. **Tirozzi**. The chiefs really applaud the committee for taking under consideration the recommendations that deal with establishing national priorities, and you are looking at areas that really are on target in terms of special populations, at-risk youth, and effective schools. We keep using that phrase. So we are very supportive of that.

Also, the increased emphasis on evaluation is very important.

Mr. **Solarz**. So you support H.R. 5 as it is written?

Mr. **Tirozzi**. As it is written?

Mr. **Solarz**. Yeah, I mean, the bill we have before us.

Mr. **Tirozzi**. Yes.

Mr. **Solarz**. You do not have any changes to recommend in the language?

Mr. **Tirozzi**. Just in terms of effective schools. We want to be certain that we do not have an expectation that a district or a school could take all of the characteristics of an instructionally effective school and at one time one year implement all. It may have to be an incremental process, because it is a very complicated process——

Mr. **Solarz**. Right.

Mr. **Tirozzi**. [continuing]. As this gentleman articulated so well.

Mr. **Solarz**. The others?

Mr. **Atwood**. Sir, I would just like to state that we want to maintain the flexibility in Chapter 2, we as a school district, and also the—as a national association, I feel would be opposed to earmarking funds specifically for effective schools or for X or for Y. So we have a district objective that we have to look at every year, that the State of Florida requires us to compile, and we must adhere to them. And in looking over the eight objectives that we have, I noticed that at least one of our Chapter 2 programs addresses every or at least one objective. Every objective in here is addressed by Chapter 2. That kind of flexibility is important to us.

Mr. **Solarz**. You just did your study?

Dr. **Turnbull**. [Nods.]

Mr. **Solarz**. OK. Let me ask you Mr. Terrell. I recently saw an article in the paper. I think it was, last week or so, which was actually, quite disturbing, and I do not know whether what it said is true or not. Given your work in trying to improve education in schools with predominant minority enrollments which you described in your testimony, I would like to ask you about it.

The thrust of the article as I recall it was that among minority students in schools, and it was not clear to me whether they were describing a national phenomena or just a local one in a particular area, but they were saying that one of the problems of educational achievement in those schools that the article was describing was that there seemed to be an attitude on the part of many of the minority students that if they did well in school, they would be accused by their peers of trying to imitate Whitey, and that their esteem in the eyes of their peers would go down. This created a cultural atmosphere in which doing well in school was discouraged rather than encouraged.

I would like to know whether you sense that at all, or whether this is a total misrepresentation or a myth, or whether in fact it is a problem. If it is, how does one deal with it?

Dr. **Terrell**. I think it was, I would suggest, an exaggeration. There is some basis of reality, but I think it is greatly exaggerated, and again, I go back to the, I think, the issue of—and one of the major focuses in taking a look at, and my belief in the effective schools movement, is that it sets a climate in the school that says learning and succeeding are okay. And I think that is what becomes critical. And my opinion is that has to be a schoolwide phenomena, that kids in the school all have to think first of all that they can learn, and then it becomes okay to do so. And that is one of the major aspects that abides in effective schools, which takes away the peer pressure in terms of not succeeding; that succeeding becomes then what happens on a schoolwide basis.

And I think that is what has to be encouraged. It is tough in some schools, again, when special programs are put in place and a few students are achieving, they do get pressure for those who are not being successful, simply because they are not being successful. But when you make it a schoolwide mission that success is your goal, then that takes away that issue.

Mr. **Solarz**. One would certainly hope that it does. But you identified there were five factors that were critical for the establishment of an effective school, strong leadership, high expectations, safe and clean environment, clearly defined and stated goals, effective system to monitor and evaluate the performance of all persons in the school.

One would have thought that this is something that schools routinely do. If they do not, how does one achieve it. It is not clear to me how you get strong leadership in a school. There are a certain fixed number of principals around. If many of them are not providing strong leadership, I do not know how to get them to provide strong leadership? Or is the only way to solve the problem is to cashier tens of thousands of school administrators, because, whatever the reasons, they are not capable of strong leadership?

Dr. **Terrell**. No, I think what we have discovered are the principles that are involved, first of all, are not new, and you are right. Everybody would think that they would be in place.

What we find is that what it takes, of course, is all five of those principles to be in effect at the same time. What we found is that a principal has sometimes focused on an aspect of that without taking into consideration all the other pieces tied together. What we are finding, then, is that principals, in fact, who identify and are aware of those phenomena are beginning to put them all together and make them work. But they are only being able to do that, gain, as they are able to also bring along the rest of the faculty as part of that school team.

The other thing that I think is important about it is that it focuses entirely on what is capable of being done inside the school. Those things are controllable by the schools. They have no concern about the level of poverty or the home condition or anything else. They suggest that within the confines of the school where they have control, putting together those five phenomena will make a difference. And, again, there is evidence to say that it happens.

We need to retrain some principals, too, by the way.

Mr. **Solarz**. Well, thank—just one final question.

My wife went to an elementary school in my district last week where they have something called the peace curriculum. She was very impressed by it, and I must say, based on her description, it certainly sounded very intriguing to me. The kids are taught that there are better ways of resolving their problems or their conflicts with other kids than by beating each other up. And they are taught how to resolve problems through a process of discussion and negotiation and the like. Do any of you know about such curriculums around the country? Is this fairly common, or is it relatively rare? And do you have any thoughts about whether it would make any sense for us to encourage something like this?

Mr. **Tirozzi**. Well, I think without question over the last few years you have seen a real movement toward looking at the broad social studies curriculum and incorporating discussions on peace and, you know, various other types of related topics.

In our particular state, the—what we do is we develop guides to curriculum; we do not impose curriculum. I think those kinds of programs are going to be best served if, at the local level, decisions are made to incorporate them.

Mr. **Solarz**. Well, it would, of course, be unthinkable for us to impose, I suppose, a requirement. But the question is, does it make any sense to offer an incentive to—for something like this?

Mr. **Tirozzi**. My own sense is ideally there should be enough sense at the local school district level to look at their own civics courses and social studies courses and international relations, what have you, and incorporate these concepts. I think it is happening naturally. I, you know, maybe others have a different opinion. I would think there could be this. Do not misunderstand, this would have to be a high priority, of course, but I, again, have great confidence that at the local level a lot is being done in this area, and I could see money being used in other areas.

Mr. **Solarz**. OK. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman **Hawkins**. Mr. Grandy.

Mr. **Grandy**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Atwood, you mentioned in your comments to Mr. Solarz that the State of Florida has eight objectives they want your Chapter 2 program to accomplish? Do I understand you correctly?

Mr. **Atwood**. The school district has eight objectives. The State of Florida requires us to establish five- and 10-year plans, each school district, and part of meeting that requirement is setting up specific objectives for your district. We——

Mr. **Grandy**. Could you briefly state for the record what they are?

Mr. **Atwood**. Oh, sure.

OK, these are broad goals. One, to improve academic achievement to meet continued education and career objectives. Two, to improve student activity, to improve student attitudes towards self, school, and community. Three, to improve classroom teacher performance. Four, to improve management performance. Five, to improve district and school-based planning and budgeting. Six, to improve citizen, staff, and student involvement in the decision-making process. Seven, to improve the use of new and emerging technology. And the last one is to provide adequate facilities.

Chapter 2 does not directly address providing adequate facilities.

Mr. **Grandy**. Thank you. I wanted to zero in on your third objective, which is classroom teacher performance. You mentioned in your testimony you are going to be implementing an in-service program for secondary mathematics teachers, to be called mathematics——

Mr. **Atwood**. Modeling.

Mr. **Grandy**. [continuing]. Modeling.

Mr. **Atwood**. Right.

Mr. **Grandy**. Are you, upscaling your mathematics teaching there?

Mr. **Atwood**. Yes, sir.

Mr. **Grandy**. Under which category would that fall?

Mr. **Atwood**. That would be in number three, to improve classroom teacher performance, yes.

Mr. **Grandy**. I am concerned about that, because I read recently in the National Journal a comment by Albert Shanker which disturbs me, saying that the majority of people coming into our teaching ranks, "the majority are in the bottom quartile of all college students, and a passing mark for a teacher is 65 percent on a sixth-grade arithmetic test, and 35 percent of the prospective applicants fail the examination."

Assume this is true, and that we are having a diminution in quality of the people that are entering teaching and there are reasons not related to this hearing for that. But I would like to go then to your testimony, Dr. Turnbull, about the amount of dollars that are spent for computer services versus the amount of dollars that seem to be spent for staff development, which I assume would be this on-the-job training or performance upgrading.

Do you think that is a little skewed? Are we perhaps running the risk down the line of spending too much money on computers at the expense of perhaps retraining a cadre of teachers that we are going to need if our education is going to become competitive?

Dr. **Turnbull**. Well, there is no question that more of Chapter 2 is being—more of Chapter 2 funds are being spent on computers than on staff development, although about something around 30 percent of the funds do go into staff development.

Mr. **Grandy**. Well, I agree with you. I am just asking if that this committee at the federal level, the federal government, needs to intercede here. Looking ahead towards our needs in the classroom—obviously if you are going to train students, assuming you are not putting them all in front of a green screen and letting them program their own education, you are going to need somebody to supervise that program.

Without some type of categorical grant, which I am normally opposed to when it comes to allowing you to administer your own programs, do we need some type of federal oversight here in the Chapter 2 program to allow for you to retrain or upscale or improve the general quality of teaching? Do we need more money for staff development, bottom line?

Dr. **Turnbull**. I am not sure, but it would be worth noting that Chapter 2 is not the only federal program that supports staff development. There is quite a lot supported out of Chapter 1 and the other categorical programs. Those activities are not necessarily coordinated locally.

Mr. **Grandy**. Well, you are probably right, but if we believe what Mr. Shanker says here, apparently what we are doing is not enough, either at the state, local, or federal level.

Do any of the rest of you have comments about that?

Mr. **Tirozzi**. One of the national priorities which you are considering in the reauthorization is enhancing the quality of educational personnel, and that speaks to the issue of staff development. I think what you—we all might want to do is let this play out for a couple of years. For example, as I understand the reauthorization and your considerations, districts can look at their own individual needs and submit plans, and states can look at needs across the state. And I think, over time, if we look at evaluations on how money is being used—and I do share your concern very much. I think one of the issues, one of the main problems, with computers, we have all rushed to have computers in classrooms because everyone said it was a good idea and parents insisted upon it, and we did not really train teachers in terms of how to use those well. So we do have the electronic worksheets that many of us are concerned with.

But I—my own personal feeling is to let it play out for a couple years, monitor it carefully. That is why I go back to something I said earlier in looking at the reauthorization, evaluation is a key, and we really need a presence in terms of evaluate how the money is being used, and if we are seeing outcomes. And if that is not the case, then over time we may have to be even more prescriptive.

But I think when you look at the—that particular emphasis, and also looking at effective schools, to move in the area of effective schools, you are going to have to be extensively involved in professional development.

Mr. **Grandy**. Do you concur with Mr. Shanker's observations?

Mr. **Tirozzi**. That we are recruiting a pool of people from the bottom quartile? Absolutely.

Mr. **Grandy**. Mr. Terrell, you were shaking your head in agreement vigorously. Do you have a comment to add?

Dr. **Terrell**. Just yes, yes.

Yeah, the level of staff development is needed, and it does not only address those who we are currently recruiting. It—the need to update those who are already in place, I think, becomes a critical issue, and——

Mr. **Grandy**. But you would still leave that authority with the state and LEAs to service their own staff personnel before you have the Federal Government come in and perhaps dictate what they might be?

Dr. **Terrell**. Yes, and I would also agree, though, that we take a look at and watch that as it is progressing to see if there is improvement being made; the school improvement we are looking for, we are getting. I think it is best served at the local level for determining staff development needs.

Mr. **Grandy**. But I assume all of you on the panel are in agreement that perhaps we might be careening too much towards computer use as opposed to developing the staff side of our educational ranks?

Mr. **Tirozzi**. I think we are in a recovery period.

Mr. **Grandy**. OK.

Mr. **Tirozzi**. If I think we went through a period of time when absolutely we just simply rushed to have computers in schools. But I, you know, I want to make it clear, some districts did a good job; the majority did not.

I think we are in the recovery period in that, at least in my state, I am familiar with a number of major projects that are looking at the computer in a different way, looking at staff development for teachers, looking at the computer as being a tool for more creative experiences for youngsters, including youngsters in the Chapter 1 program. So I think we are in a recovery period. It is sort of a learning curve, if you wish. But I would suggest we still have a long way to go before we use the computers.

Mr. **Grandy**. I would agree with you. I hope down the line we do not become computer-dependent in our program design. I know in my district of northwest Iowa, Mason City has an excellent program at their high school which is designed to incorporate what used to be shop with science into a principles of technology course, where you actually build things or take them apart and understand and study the scientific principles behind them.

No computers involved but a lot of good hands-on training by teachers that used to be shop teachers that are now teaching principles of science.

I hope a program like that would get more exposure, as opposed to, perhaps, something that would be simply software.

Mr. **Tirozzi**. And just to build on your use of the word "software", one of the critical issues early on was the lack of quality software for many of these computers. And we are seeing a significant improvement in software in the IBM program, Writing to Read, is a classic example of what can be done to impact on instruction. So software has to be improved, and is improving.

Mr. **Grandy**. Finally, I was not here at the beginning of your testimony, but did any of you comment on the present request of 529 million, which I believe the vice chairman has also requested? Is that sufficient to continue along this line?

Somebody should answer this question.

Dr. **Terrell**. There is never enough.

Mr. **Grandy**. There is never enough. OK, thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The **Chairman**. Mr. Wise.

Mr. **Wise**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Following up on that last question, if I could summarize each of your testimonies. Would it be that, number one, you support what is in the bill before the committee; number two, that you do not have disagreements with any part of it or would you seek more money than what has been authorized in the past?

Is that a fair assessment?

Let the record show I did not see a dissenting nod.

I have several questions for Dr. Terrell. In the challenge grant system, whom would the school make application to, if you were putting it together, for a challenge grant?

Dr. **Terrell**. I would hold those moneys at state level.

Mr. **Wise**. Would each state receive an amount that it would then be able to set aside for this purpose, that it would then be able to disburse?

Dr. **Terrell**. From my point of view, yes.

Mr. **Wise**. Would anyone else care to comment on that?

Mr. **Tirozzi**. I am sorry? I was getting some——

Mr. **Wise**. The question was, how would application be made for challenge grants? Whom would the school apply to?

Mr. **Tirozzi**. Well, we have run a number of challenge grants in our state, and they apply to the state. We review the proposals, we generally put together a cross-section of individuals, so it is very fair and objective. We generally read the applications blind, so I think that would work.

Mr. **Wise**. As you look at the bill before the committee, does anyone have any observations on the question of rural versus urban districts, and how it shakes out, whether there is a gainer or a loser?

Mr. **Tirozzi**. Just a point of clarification. I am having occasionally—getting some advice here, because I have not seen a final draft of the Chapter 2 bill, and I do not know if we have that yet. WE do not have that yet, so it is difficult, you know, to say yes or no to some of these questions, especially when it is going on the record. I mean, I think we absolutely support Chapter 2. Just about everything we understand will be in the bill we support, and I just want to make my position clear. Unless I really have the bill in front of me, some of these questions are difficult to say yes or no to.

Mr. **Wise**. Oh, I have had to answer many news reporters on the basis of less information than——

Mr. **Tirozzi**. Thank you. I do it back home all the time.

No, but I just wanted to clarify some of the answers.

Mr. **Wise**. Okay, well, you make an excellent point.

Well, let me ask you, then, about the present status of funding, and perhaps, Commissioner Tirozzi, you would be the best one to go to on that because I assume you oversee both rural and urban districts.

Mr. **Tirozzi**. Yes, we do.

Mr. **Wise**. And I just wondered whether you have any suggestions that could be made. I come from a rural state, and a little concerned about where that is going.

Mr. **Tirozzi**. Well, our own experience in Connecticut, and Connecticut is a very interesting state. It is really an anomaly. I call it two Connecticuts, separate and unequal. When we look at poverty and we look at youngsters who are educationally disadvantaged, yes, we do find them in the urban community, no question about that. But we also find them in Connecticut in the very small rural communities. And that is a significant problem.

And generally where you have these very small districts, somewhat isolated, poor, they, too, are not in a position to provide funds and support for education. So, while on the one hand, you know, we speak to concentration, and I support that, at the same time, you know, we have to be very concerned about the rural districts and the youngsters residing in those districts who have needs that are just about the same.

So I, you know, would hope that anything we do does not offset the need to provide support in rural communities.

Dr. **Terrell**. I would concur with that. I had spent a good bit of time two years ago, I guess, doing some work in Delano, California, which is rural Central Valley for us, Delano Union High School, where the achievement level in that school district was—they were in the first percentile in the state. And clearly, the need is there as great as it is in inner-city Los Angeles, and by definition they would fit, in my opinion, the need for challenge grants or be allowed to be involved in challenge grants for effective schools, based on that achievement level.

Mr. **Wise**. Dr. Terrell, the next question I guess I would have is really for you, and it follows a little bit with what Mr. Hayes was saying. In many of the counties that I represent, I would say that 60 to 80 percent of the children are in free or reduced lunch, and a large amount receive unemployment and AFDC. The only difference, perhaps, from Mr. Hayes's district is that there is a very low pecentage of minority people, but poverty cuts the same everywhere.

We have had some debate in our state as to setting up lighthouse schools in which you put a lot of state dollars, and I presume you would steer some Chapter 2 dollars to it as well. These lighthouse schools would be models across the state, say eight to 10, and then you hope that they would also become teaching centers. Of course, the argument runs the other way that the state ought to be spreading some of this out among everybody and improving everybody's lot, as opposed to focusing here.

I recognize the fact that you are looking at schools that are making it and extrapolating that to others. Whereas what I am asking is—is there merit in trying to make a few model schools, really focusing on them, and then hoping that what you have done there begins to lift others, or should you simply focus on getting these resources to as many people as possible?

Dr. **Terrell**. I would certainly take a focus, and I think we start with looking at those that have been successful, and then we take those same principles, and I guess what I am looking to support is not those that are being successful, but taking some other models, spreading the model to those that are not being successful, but using the principles on those that have been successful to make them successful.

And again, I do not think that is going to happen simply by saying, look at that school and see what is happening there. Just human nature tells me that some kind of an incentive has to be included to make a school really make the effort to do that.

It is hard work. Improving a school is a heck of a lot of hard work, and I think some incentive is going to be necessary to get people to move to it.

Mr. **Wise**. Then you think the challenge grant concept is that incentive?

Dr. **Terrell**. It will give those principals who are not doing well, but who have a desire to move their school, an incentive to get them and the rest of the faculty involved in doing that. And I think just in terms of morale, where school staffs are now, that some kind of small indicator saying, we recognize the fact that you are going to make an effort and therefore we are going to give you a little money to do that, I think we will find, will go a long way.

Mr. **Wise**. Actually, it seems to me, with that approach, you might be able to, rather than focusing on a few schools and make them the lighthouses, with challenge grants you do not have to spend as much, but you may get a lot of the same process stirring in a lot of schools.

Dr. Terrell. I would hope that many schools are going to move that are not being effective, are going to move to doing some things in the arena of effectiveness, but I think what we are going to do is need to, if you will, create more lighthouses, more lighthouses, to have more say, aha, there are 10 of them, now there are 20 of them, now there are 30 of them, for the process to really, I think, take on the kind of movement that we see it needs to take on.

And I think they have to really be those that stand out, that they really can be clearly identified as being different from those that look like them, but are not making it as well.

Mr. Wise. Thank you very much.

Mr. Hayes. Mr. Sawyer.

Mr. Sawyer. No questions.

Mr. Hayes. I want to say—the Chairman had to leave leave—that I have enjoyed what I consider to have been excellent testimony and discussion here, both written and oral. Your entire written statements will be made a part of this record.

And it can help us immensely, hopefully, as we proceed towards our efforts to get the reauthorization, the funding levels, that have been recommended. If by some chance, we can maybe exceed that amount, I—you have indicated you would be very appreciative of that, too, as administrators of our educational system.

So we want to thank you for having sacrificed your time and your efforts to be here with us this morning, and you might contact some of your Representatives who work with us in Congress and indicate to them—who are not a part of this committee—that their vote might be helpful in trying to get a reauthorization through.

Thank you very much.

This concludes our hearing.

[Whereupon, at 11:40 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned.]

[Additional material submitted for the record follows:]

Testimony on Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act

What Have We Learned From Local School Districts?

Submitted by Maybelle Taylor Bennett, Director of Research, Coalition on Human Needs.

CHAPTER 2 OF THE EDUCATION BLOCK GRANT: WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED FROM LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS?

In the last one and one-half years, the Coalition on Human Needs studied twenty localities throughout the country, both urban and rural, in order to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the Chapter 2 education block grant and its implementation at the local school district level. As reauthorization of the program is currently coming before Congress, the lessons learned from having monitored those districts in FY' 86 are significant and timely.

Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 was a combination of 28 federal categorical programs which were combined together to form the education block grant. The purposes of the block grant is to "financially assist state and local education agencies to improve elementary and secondary education (including preschool education) for children attending both public and non-public schools." This goal was to be attained in a way which would reduce the administrative burden on school districts so they could devote more time to educating children.

The combined programs provide support for a range of activities, from library resources, to computers, to metric studies, special cultural heritage projects and desegregation activities. The latter was the most heavily funded of the categorical programs, and one result of combining these very diverse activities was that school disstrict's competing needs were now being met out of a reduced single source of funding, where before those same needs were met by better supported separate sources of funding. As a result, less money was available to cover more needs areas. This was especically true of larger urban school districts which had used numerous categorical programs, especially those which supported desegregation activities (ESAA, the Emergency School Aid Act).

The drafters of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 incorporated valuable principles within the language of the Act. First, that *federal education assistance* to states and localities *should be targeted to public which have special educational needs* as well as to the overall enrollment of school districts for the purpose of enhancing local educational improvement efforts. Funds were to be made available to local school districts". . . according to the relaive enrollment in public and nonpublic schools within the school districts . . . adjusted . . . to provide which have the greatest numbers or percentages of children whose education imposes a higher than average cost per child, such as: children from low income families, children living in economically depressed urban and rural areas, and children living in sparsely populated areas."

A second principle acknowledged in the legislation was the value of *systematic consultation with parents* of children attending elementary and secondary school in the area seerved by such schools, and with teachers, and administrative personnel in such school, and with other groups. . ." (emphasis added). Input from these groups was to go into the design, planning and implementation of local Chapter 2-supported activities.

Third, the ECIA Chapter 2 language calls for the states to provide "an annual *ealuation of the effectivess of programs assisted under this chapter* beginning with FY 1984 (emphasis added). Certainly, Congress was concerned that there be some means by which the program's accomplishments could be assessed.

While targeting parent consultation, and evaluation requirements were built into the statute, that same statute fails to provide the mechanisms for the execution of these provisions. As a result, compliance with these sections of the law became optional and often did not take place. So widespread were these observations, that monitors began to seriously question whether Congress truly intended these requirements to be met all. It is clear then, that in the absence of strengthened language, targeting, parental input and program assessment are greatly threatened and, in some cases, could possibly disappear.

SUMMARY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Failure to target pupils with special needs

Among the 20 school districts monitored, only 9 (less than half) attempted to target Chapter 2 activities to children with special state-identified needs (see Figure I). Though the presence of these children brought additional Chapter 2 funds to their school districts typically, the districts used their funds to carry out activities that were not necessarily focused around special needs as they were around programs that they believed would benefit students throughout the system. The assumptions are that the program will automatically benefit at-risk children if Chapter 2 activities are made "universally" available, or that the administration and staff would find it necessary to make greater use of these activities in response to special needs, and thus a certain "natural" targeting would take place.

These assumptions ignore the fact that at-risk children would not be at-risk if they could make as successful use of educational opportunities as the overall general enrollment without special assistance. The assumptions further belie the fact that in the absence of trying to address specifically identified needs among students, "natural" targeting is unlikely to occur.

Figure I.—State Formulae for Distributing Chapter 2 Allocations to Local Education Agencies as Adjusted for State-Identified Special Needs in Fiscal Year 1986

State	Allocation based on enrollment	Allocation based on low income	Allocation based on other special needs
Arizona	85.0	5.0	5.0 low and high achievers. 5.0 small schools.
California	74.1	13.3	10.5 limited English proficiency. 2.1 sparse population.

Figure I.—State Formulae for Distributing Chapter 2 Allocations to Local Education Agencies as Adjusted for State-Identified Special Needs in Fiscal Year 1986—Continued

State	Allocation based on enrollment	Allocation based on low income	Allocation based on other special needs
Delaware	70.0	10.0	10.0 gifted and talented. 10.0 handicapped.
Illinois	70.0	30.0	
Kentucky	86.0	5.0	7.0 sparse population. 2.0 high tax, low expenditure.
Louisiana	85.0	10.0	5.0 handicapped, special education
Maine	80.0	20.0	
Missouri	81.0	17.0	2.0 small schools.
New York [1]			1.0 full day kindergarten. 0.5 ½ day kindergarten. 0.25 grades 7–12. 0.35 special education. 2.0 handicapped (60% +). 2.0 handicapped (20–60%). 0.13 handicapped (under 20%). 0.05 limited English proficiency.
North Carolina	70.0	30.0	
Texas	73.0	13.0	6.0 limited English proficiency. 8.0 handicapped.

[1] Enrollment weighted: Districts are also eligible for sparsity correction, pupils with special educational needs adjustment, and adjustments based on the district's wealth.

The Chapter 2 case study conducted in Gardiner, Maine was illustrative of the flaws in these assumptions. While funds supported activities that were essentially systemwide (i.e. media center, staff development, student evaluation, and gifted and talented programs), schools with the greatest concentration of low income children made far less use of these services than did schools where the percentages of low income pupils were lower. Hence, absent a deliberate strategy to target or equitably expose pupils with special needs to such funded activities, it is possible for those students who need them most, to benefit little, if at all, from Chapter 2.

Of note in this study is the fact that there was more targeting among the larger jurisdictions than among those that were smaller. Half (5) of the larger districts targeted children with special needs, while only 30% (3) of the smaller ones did the same. This pattern could have developed because of the larger districts; size, their experience with more diverse populations and their histories of having been recipients of Emergency School Aid Act funding (for desegregation activities) prior to 1982. Each of these factors may have reinforced the need for and practice of targeting specific activities to children with special needs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The statute should provide for the Secretary of the Department of Education to review state formulas based on a set of criteria and standards which determine their adequacy for use in allocating funds to local education agencies. This is especially important in the identification of high cost factors and the special needs they represent.

Local education agencies which receive high cost allocations should be required to: 1) use Chapter 2 funds for activities which will address the state-identified special needs of students and 2) demonstrate that benefit from those activities flowed to those students in an equitable manner.

The statute should require states to monitor local education agencies to insure that districts which receive high cost allocations can demonstate that special needs of children are addressed in the activities supported by Chapter 2 funds. Where students' needs for Chapter 2 activities is greater, a greater concentration of those activities should be made available to them. At the very minimum, children with special needs should share equitably in the benefits derived from the program.

Failure to solicit meaningful parental input

Over half (13) of the twenty school districts monitored had advisory committees on which parents participated in determining how Chapter 2 funds were to be spent.

However, when the quality of parent consultation was examined, it was found that among the thirteen, only three districts have what could be characterized as significant input as measured by:

the extent to which parents actually suggested activities, equipment, or improvements which were supported by Chapter 2 vs. rubber stamping a school administration's proposals; and

the extent to which parents had an opportunity to challenge and/or change proposed Chapter 2-supported activities.

RECOMMENDATION

The provision which calls for parent consultation should be strengthened to require the establishment of a local advisory committee which:

Is comprised of parents, students, teachers, administrators, and other community members as may be appropriate;

Meets on a regular basis to discuss student needs, school resources, and the application of Chapter 2 to meeting those needs; and

Participate in and agrees on the design, planning, and implementation of the Chapter 2 expenditure plan.

Failure to Adequately Assess Program Impact

In only three of the twenty localities monitored, were portions of the evaluations conducted by the local education agencies adequate to demonstrate the impact that Chapter 2 activities had on improving the elementary and secondary education of the school district's pupils. In these sites, Chapter 2 activities were either: evaluated with other programs which require the measurement of impacts (e.g. desegregation and magnet school programs), or simply identified and carried out a combination of evaluation techniques which would reveal whatever improvements did or did not take place. Such techniques included pre- and post-testing, completion of evaluation checklists, demonstrated proficiency in operating equipment, completing tasks, or accomplishing measurable objectives.

As many educators and lawmakers have pointed out, the evaluation of a program requires additional time and paperwork. However, program accountability does have a cost, and other programs equally as complex, have required the kind of uniformity in program reporting and impact measurement evaluation recommended here.

RECOMMENDATION

The statute should require a uniform evaluation tool which is used by all local school districts in identifying:

What goals and objectives were intended to be met through the expenditure of Chapter 2 funds;

What activities were undertaken in order to meet these objectives;

What the measurable program accomplishments were;

Whether the accomplishments fell short, met, or exceeded the goals and objectives established; and

Corrective action needed if the accomplishments failed to meet the objectives set forth.

TABLE I. COMPARISON OF SELECT CHAPTER 2 PERFORMANCE MEASURES IN URBAN LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES
STUDIED IN FORD MONITORING PROJECT FY '86

Urban LEA	Any Attempt to Target Funds to Pupils With State-Identified Special Needs?			Quality of LEA's Evaluation				Parent Consultation? (*)=Meaningful		
	Yes	No	Describe Efforts	Good	Fair	Poor	Comment	Yes	No	Comment
1. Louisville, Ky.	X		ESAA activities targeted at 9th grade levels and above in 25 schools. Youth Performing Arts school receives Chap. 2 arts activities; staff development is systemwide.			X	Opinion poll taken. No objective measure of improvement.	X *		Advisory committee made up of parents, community persons, and administrators.
2. Fresno, Calif.	X		ESAA activities are targeted to three magnet schools.	X			Chap. 2 desegregation programs are coupled with other programs which routinely measure impacts		X	Have not consulted with parents since ECIA became law.
						X	Non-desegregation programs and nonpublic schools' programs do not measure program impact.			
3. Yonkers, N.Y.		X	Teacher trainers, supplies, materials, textbooks, etc. made available systemwide. School desegregation lawsuit still in progress.			X	No attempt to measure educational improvement.	X *		PTA advisory committee reviews and comments on administration proposals.
4. Houston, Texas	X		Computers purchased with Chap. 2 funds were used in Chap. 1 schools. 25 year-round schools received funding to help improve student achievement. 21 of these were Chap. 1 schools.			X	No attempt to measure impact of activities. In 1982, this practice was discontinued for Chap. 2 but was continued for Chap. 1.	X		Citizen input through school board meeting where "Chap. 2" discussion has been advertised on the agenda Parents in schools with Chap. 2 activities are surveyed for feedback on programs.
5. New Orleans, La.		X	Library resources targeted to schools with substandard libraries; staff development targeted to teachers who are new or who have difficulties. Remaining activities are systemwide.			X	Evaluation was descriptive. No attempt to measure educational improvement.		X	'86, no parent consultation. '87, parents participate on advisory committee, though they have no vote, will play role in determining spending priorities.
6. Greensboro, N.C.		X	Chap. 2 funds targeted to schools not eligible for Chap. 1.	--	--	--	Unable to determine. Local administrators would not make evaluation available to monitor.	X		Local advisory committee established for Chap. 1 is also used for Chap. 2.

TABLE I. (cont.) COMPARISON OF SELECT CHAPTER 2 PERFORMANCE MEASURES IN URBAN LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES STUDIED IN FORD MONITORING PROJECT FY '86

Urban LLA	Any Attempt to Target Funds to Pupils With State-Identified Special Needs?			Quality of LLA's Evaluation				Parent Consultation? (*)= Meaningful		
	Yes	No	Describe Efforts	Good	Fair	Poor	Comment	Yes	No	Comment
7. Kansas City, Mo.	X		Integration activities such as magnet schools and basic activities which lost ESAA money are what Chap. 2 funds are spent on.			X	No attempt to measure educational improvement.	X		Administrators consult with school advisory groups in which parents participate.
8. Los Angeles, Calif	X		Chap. 2 money funded transitional bilingual teaching model.			X	No attempt to measure educational improvements resulting from library resources, computers, and audio visuals. Compliance checked only.	X		Administrators consult with school advisory group representatives who include parents and other community individuals.
				X			Impact of effectiveness of teaching model is measured.			
9. Portland, Me.		X	Chap. 2 funds targeted to Portland High School to develop new teaching models for gifted and talented students. FY '87 money will be more dispersed among grade levels, including Chap. 1 elementary schs.			X	Evaluation is largely narrative description of program for FY '86. '87 will emphasize measuring program accomplishments.		X	'86 No parent consultation process. '87 Parent consultation initiative begun using Chap. 1 parent advisory group to consult on use og Chap. 2 funds.
10. Phoenix, Arizona	X		Chap. 2 money is targeted to magnet schools and other desegregation activities.			X	Only one out of eleven activities measured the degree of educational improvement. Most evaluations were descriptive or based on opinion polls.	X		District block grant committee consists of parents, teachers and administrators.

TABLE II. COMPARISON OF SELECT CHAPTER 2 PERFORMANCE MEASURES IN RURAL AND SMALLER LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES STUDIED IN FORD MONITORING PROJECT FY '86

Rural/Smaller LEA	Any Attempt to Target Funds to Pupils With State-Identified Special Needs?			Quality of LEA's Evaluation				Parent Consultation? (*)= Meaningful		
	Yes	No	Describe Efforts	Good	Fair	Poor	Comment	Yes	No	Comment
1. Gardiner, Me.		X	All activities available systemwide.			X	No attempt to measure educational improvement.		X	Public is consulted and must approve by vote, the school budget exclusive of Chap. 2. Parents are not consulted re: how to spend Chap. 2 funds.
2. East Moline, Ill.		X	All activities available systemwide.	X			Results of funded activities are measured by pre- and post- testing; completion of evaluation checklists; student, staff, and parent surveys, etc.	X *		Parents were sent surveys and information sheets on Chap. 2. Were asked how Chap. 2 money should be spent.
3. Plaquemines Parish, La.		X	All activities available systemwide.			X	No attempt to measure educational improvement.	X		Meetings were scheduled for parents, librarians, and principals to meet to discuss school needs which could be addressed with Chap 2
4. El Centro, Calif.		X	88% of pupils are Chap. 1 eligible. Chap. 2 distributed on per capita basis to schools. Funds used to supplement programs for educationally disadvantaged and former desegregation programs.			X	Compliance review only. No attempt to measure educational improvement.	X		Each school has parent advisory group. They and teachers are consulted on use of funds.
5. Brawley, Calif		X	80% of pupils are Chap. 1 eligible. Staff development and innovative teaching methods activities are systemwide.		X		Participants evaluate activities' effectiveness.	X		Parent advisory body is the same as for Chap. 1.
6. La Joya, Texas	X		All activities are cultural enrichment activities targeted at low achievers to give them incentive to stay in school. Attendance and good grades are required to participate.			X	Majority of LEA enrollment is also in Chap. 1 and Migrant programs. Chap. 2 impact is hard to determine.	X		Parent advisory body is same as for Chap. 1 and Migrant Program.
7. Caruthersville, Mo.		X	Activities are available systemwide.			X	No attempt to measure educational improvement.		X	Parent advisory group exists but is not consulted re: Chap. 2.

TABLE II. (cont.) COMPARISON OF SELECT CHAPTER 2 PERFORMANCE MEASURES IN RURAL AND SMALLER
LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES STUDIED IN FORD MONITORING PROJECT FY '86

Rural/Smaller LEA	Any Attempt to Target Funds to Pupils With State-Identified Special Needs?			Quality of LEAs Evaluation				Parent Consultation? (*)= Meaningful		
	Yes	No	Describe Efforts	Good	Fair	Poor	Comment	Yes	No	Comment
8. Eloy, Arizona	X		Activities targeted to children identified as gifted and talented			X	No attempt to measure educational improvement.		X	Citizen advisory committee serves as watchdog, but is not consulted about spending Chap. 2 funds.
9. Wilkes County, N.C.	X		A teacher/counselor was placed in each of three high schools where they carried out an in-school suspension program, in an attempt to prevent high schoolers with difficulties from dropping out.			X	No attempt to measure impact of Chap. 2 except in very rare instances, e.g. measurement of writing test scores.		X	Parents are involved in county school activities, including assembling newsletters, etc. Are not involved in directly dtermin- how Chap. 2 money is spent.
10. Floyd Co., Ky.		X	Equipment purchased with Chap. 2 money is distributed to all schools.			X	No attempt to measure educational improvement.	X		Advisory committee has a limited role in determining the details of how Chap. 2 activities will be implemented; however, superintendent really determines what Chap. 2 overall priorities will be.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ELLIOT RICHARDSON, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, READING IS FUNDAMENTAL, INC.

Re: Inexpensive Book Distribution Program, ECIA, Ch. 2, D, Sec. 583(b)(1).

Reading Is Fundamental, Inc. (RIF) appreciates the opportunity to present testimony on reauthorization of the Inexpensive Book Distribution Program (IBDP). RIF operates the IBDP under contract to the Department of Education. The IBDP makes it possible for RIF to develop reading motivation programs and to match local funds for the purchase of books for children.

Present authorization includes mandates

The IBDP is authorized in the ECIA, Chapter 2, D, Sec. 583(b)(1) which reads: "From the funds reserved for the purposes of this section, the Secretary shall first fund—(1) the Inexpensive Book Distribution Program (as carried out through 'Reading Is Fundamental') . . . at least in amounts necessary to sustain the activities . . . at the level of operation during fiscal year 1981 . . ."

Thus in reauthorizing the IBDP in 1981 the Congress included wording to assure continuity and continuation of the IBDP by: (1) mandating the Secretary to fund the IBDP, (2) to fund it at a floor of no less than the 1981 level, and (3) to fund it "as carried out through 'Reading Is Fundamental'." The Congress, additionally, authorized "such sums as may be necessary" to be appropriated for the duration of the 1981 Act.

Administration proposal

The Administration has proposed reauthorization language asking Congress to abandon the mandate, the funding floor, and the reference to Reading Is Fundamental. The Administration's proposed language simply asks that the Secretary be authorized to operate the IBDP—in other words, leaving the future of the program entirely to the discretion of the Secretary of Education.

Reading is fundamental recommends the following

Reading Is Fundamental respectfully urges the Congress to retain the essentials of the 1981 IBDP authorization: the mandate to fund, the reference to Reading Is Fundamental, and the funding floor. We request that the floor be updated to "the level of operation during fiscal 1987," and that the authorized appropriations be continued as "such sums as may be necessary."

I. THAT THE CONGRESS CONTINUE THE MANDATE TO FUND THE IBDP

To insure continuity vital to retention of a widespread, varied, grassroots volunteer network: Some 86,000 citizens from all walks of life (35% of them parents of children served) volunteer to operate IBDP programs. Local IBDP programs receive no overhead for paid staff or other administrative purposes. They receive only funds for books for children. Any break in the program would result in a dismantling of the volunteer network and seroiusly jeopardize the cost effectiveness and success of the IBDP.

To protect this highly successful program from vulnerability to varying priorities of changing Departmental staff and officials and from damaging effects of unrelated and unpredictable events such as recent protracted litigation involving the Department of Education and the Chicago Board of Education: Although the case had nothing to do with the IBDP/RIF, only the mandate shielded the IBDP from serious disruption and possible elimination when other funds for this section of the ECIA were frozen.

To assure continuance of a proven and successful program that: Gets children to read: We are grateful for this Committee's consistent efforts to increase literacy among America's young people. We are pleased to be able to report back to you that the IBDP is turning millions of youngsters into readers throughout the 50 states, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

Since Congress established the IBDP in 1976, the IBDP has consistently received high marks for its success in gettting children to read—from educators, parents, public officials, local citizens, and the Congress itself. Through the years, evidence has mounted that this low-cost program achieves remarkable results in improving:

Children's attitudes toward reading;
Amount of time they read;
Use of libraries;
Reading abilities; and
Parents' involvement in their children's education.

A 1986 survey of local projects resoundingly reconfirmed these results of the IBDP.

The IBDP reaches young people during their critical years of learning, helping them to acquire that most basic of all skills: reading. It does so by providing activities and an atmosphere that makes children want to read. Then it goes a step further by making it possible for them to have books of their own—books they choose because they like them—to take home, to keep, and to read. And it involves parents in the process.

A number of recent research studies have underscored the effectiveness of this approach. The NIE's "Becoming a Nation of Readers," and the Education Department's "What Works" both note that providing youngsters with easy access to books of interest to them is an essential step toward literacy. The reports also emphasize the value of freedom of choice, books in the home, providing motivation to read, and parental involvement—all key ingredients of the IBDP.

Enjoys widespread grassroots support: A network of more than 3,100 community-based projects reaches children in some 10,000 locations, including schools, libraries, day care centers, migrant labor camps, centers for the handicapped, hospitals, Indian reservations, juvenile detention centers, housing projects, programs for immigrants, and other places where children congregate. Thus, the benefits are multiplied because the IBDP is reaching children in a variety of settings, in and out of school.

Local citizen volunteers make all the important decisions about the operation of their IBDP/RIF projects: which books to purchase with the IBDP matching funds, which children to serve, and what activities to offer to reinforce interest in reading. And more than 9,300 local businesses and organizations aid the programs with volunteers, funding, and goods.

The program's reputation for success generates extraordinary local demand for the IBDP. Our mail tells us that, were sufficient funds available, RIF could easily reach as many as 700,000 additional children each year.

Is Low-Cost, Cost-Effective Program, Reaching 2 Million Plus Children: Last year RIF and the IBDP reached more than 2 million children at the remarkable low-cost to the government of $3.36 per child. Further, this effective partnership between the Federal government, the grassroots volunteer network, and Reading Is Fundamental has served as leverage to multiply the Federal effort. We estimate that RIF, its local projects and its private sector partners bring about $3.00 in private funds, goods and services for every $1 of Federal IBDP funds. All of this adds up to a low-cost program which makes it possible to reach large numbers of children at a negligible cost to the government.

II. THAT THE REFERENCE TO READING IS FUNDAMENTAL BE RETAINED

By including in the 1981 ECIA a specific reference to Reading Is Fundamental, Congress at once reiterated clear Congressional intent and assured continuity and cost-effectiveness of the IBDP.

When Congress established the IBDP in 1976, it modelled the program on the successful, then decade-old, Reading Is Fundamental.

Both in the 1976 and subsequent authorizations and in appropriations legislative history, the Congress has made clear its intent that the IBDP is to be operated by Reading Is Fundamental.

RIF has operated the IBDP for 10 years. RIF has in place: a well-refined streamlined system to provide book funds for the local IBDP projects. (Local projects receive no funds for overhead); a nationwide network of 86,000 volunteers; nationally negotiated agreements between RIF and 357 book suppliers for special services and book discounts to local projects; an experienced and trained staff to provide technical guidance on reading motivation and program operations to local volunteers.

RIF is able to bring to the IBDP a range of privately-funded programs, materials and services. At no cost to the government, for example, RIF has brought to IBDP projects materials and workshops for parents, donated books, a national reading incentive program, a national poster contest, a public service media campaign, and other goods and services.

III. READING IS FUNDAMENTAL RECOMMENDS CONTINUATION OF THE FUNDING FLOOR, AND THAT THE FLOOR BE ESTABLISHED AT THE FISCAL 1987 LEVEL OF OPERATIONS

Like the mandate, the funding floor is needed:

To assure a degree of stability to the volunteer-operated, grassroots IBDP projects: In establishing a funding floor the Congress ensured that at least a guaranteed minimum funding would be available, assuring uninterrupted services to the children in local projects. This guarantee, like the mandate, has provided continuity at the local level for volunteers. Volunteers are essential to the program. Interrupted funding would likely result in a loss of the volunteer network so carefully developed over the years. Once dispersed, they are not easily regrouped.

To protect the IBDP from the most severe effects of unforeseen situations like the Chicago Board of Education case described above: During the years in which this case was in the courts, the funds in the Secretary's Discretionary Fund were frozen for the most part. But funding of the IBDP continued, thanks to the funding floor Congress had written into the law.

For Fiscal 1987 Congress appropriated $7.8 million for the IBDP. RIF recommends that the Congress establish a funding floor of at least the 1987 level of operations.

IV. THAT THE AUTHORIZED LEVEL BE "SUCH SUMS AS MAY BE NECESSARY"

By authorizing "such sums as may be necessary," the 1981 legislation gave Congress the flexibility to respond in subsequent appropriations with expansion of the program as Congress saw a need and as funds were available. We respectfully recommend continuation of the "such sums as may be necessary" wording.

IBDP Books Inspire More and Better Reading

This Committee knows only too well the tragic consequences of illiteracy and the extent to which our children are in danger of reaching adulthood without adequate reading skills. Prevention is clearly less costly than remediation. Through RIF, the IBDP is the only nationwide program of its magnitude working to prevent illiteracy. Since RIF's founding in 1966, RIF has brought more than 78 million books into American homes. Of these, 72 million books have been placed in the hands of children through the IBDP.

A sampling of comments from local citizens indicates that with help from the IBDP, children can and do read:

"The RIF program has made a difference in reading," says RIF coordinator at the Florence Avenue School in Los Angeles. "Test scores have increased consistently over the past five years, students are enthusiastic about authoring their own books, have developed an awareness of specific books and authors and request them when visiting the library, and our school library circulation has increased."

The PTO in Etters, Pa. writes, "Newberry School is basically a rural area school which serves children from homes that often contain non-reading parents and a lack of good reading material. The RIF program gives all the children an equal chance of acquiring new reading material."

And from a high school teacher in Arlington, Vermont: "I have seen students, who normally do not read or possess books, filled with pride and reading the RIF books."

At a time when the United States is concerned about its competitiveness, there is near-universal agreement that the key to competitiveness is adequate education of our children. Reading is, of course, the foundation for all learning. Through RIF, the IBDP succeeds in getting children to read. It would seem a prudent step to reinforce (not diminish, as the Administration proposes) this proven and successful program.

Because the IBDP, as operated by Reading Is Fundamental, is a proven, low-cost, and effective means to get children to read:

We respectfully urge the Congress to reauthorize the Inexpensive Book Distribution Program and follow the Congressional precedents already set, with bipartisan support, by: mandating the Secretary of Education to fund the IBDP as operated by Reading Is Fundamental at least in amounts necessary to sustain the activities at the Fiscal 1987 level of operations.

TESTIMONY OF VERY SPECIAL ARTS

It is a pleasure to submit testimony to this subcommittee in behalf of the reauthorization of Very Special Arts. We are grateful for the interest and support this subcommittee has given Very Special Arts throughout its history and look forward to working with its members throughout the reauthorization process.

As members of the committee may know, Very Special Arts began 12 years ago when a group of educators, artists, parents, members of the disabled community and other concerned citizens joined together to form The National Committee, Arts for the Handicapped with support provided by The Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation. The committee's goal was to insure students with disabilities equal opportunity to participate in the arts, which research had indicated offered unique capabilities to enhance the education and enrich the lives of individuals with disabilities.

At that time, children and youth with disabilities had little opportunity to experience the arts as part of the education process or to share in the common artistic and cultural heritage of their communities. To meet that need, The National Committee developed and implemented its signature program, The Very Special Arts Festival (VSAF). Through this program, year-round school and community-based arts education programs were initiated which culminated in public celebrations known as Very Special Arts Festivals. A non-competitive forum, the Festival served to showcase the talents and accomplishments of children with disabilities; to catalyze the interests of teachers, parents and artists in enriching the education of disabled students with arts experiences; and to provide a means for intergrating disabled students into the mainstream of society by highlighting their abilities and accomplishments. The first Festival, with 300 participants, was held in 1974 at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

From the modest beginning 12 years ago, with the vital assistance of Congressional funding over the last eight years, that first Very Special Arts Festival has now blossomed into a national movement. Today, all 50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico sponsor Very Special Arts programs dedicated to enriching the lives of individuals with disabilities through the arts. In 1987 alone, 700 Very Special Arts Festivals will be held in communities throughout the United States providing opportunities for more than one million people to share and celebrate the accomplishments of our disabled citizens of all ages. A national television special, "A Very Special Arts Story," will be aired across the country, reaching million of people this spring. An exhibit of museum-quality artworks by artists with disabilities from across the nation will be held at the Orlando Museum of Arts in Florida. A nationwide playwriting competition now in its third year, encouraging students with and without disabilities to explore an aspect of disability in contemporary society through drama, will culminate in a performance at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. This year also, in numerous communities, disabled individuals, some of whom are blind, some wheel-chair bound, and some with severe neuromuscular disorders, will learn and grow through exposure to instruction in dance and movement enabled by the Very Special Arts program. Promising young VSA participants with special talents, such as Kenneth Mack, Jr., the feature singer of "The Star Spangled Banner" at the unveiling of the Statue of Liberty last summer, will have the opportunity to participate in Very Special Art's scholarship program, the Itzhak Perlman award, named in honor of America's leading artist who also happens to have a disability. And in more than 1,000 locations throughout the country, interested teachers, parents, artists, and community leader will participate in VSA training programs designed to expand and extend opportunties for individuals with disabilities to participate in arts programs in their communities. In addition, because of the leadership provided by the United States, 43 nations around the world have initiated Very Special Arts programs in their countries and have affiliated with Very Special Arts.

During this period of unprecedented change and growth for Very Special Arts, our enabling legislation has served us well. In 1979, the Congress, with wisdom and foresight, provided Very Special Arts with a statute that has allowed us the necessary flexibility to meet the needs of a constantly changing field. Through the continued support and interest of this subcommittee, Very Special Arts will be able to continue its efforts to provide increased opportunities in the arts for our citizens with disabilities. Thus, we are now submitting this testimony to urge you to act favorably on the single most important provision affecting Very Special Arts—a three-year extension of our authorization.

To put this request in perspective, the following table illustrates the pattern of Congressional funding which has allowed the present level of program expansion.

Year:	*Amount*
1981	$1,350,000
1982	1,350,000
1983	1,350,000
1984	1,450,000
1985	2,250,000
1986	2,250,000
1987	2,370,000

As the table indicates, Congress has generously provided Very Special Arts with an increase in funding over the last three years. During this period, Very Special Arts has utilized its Congressional appropriation to significantly improve and expand its services to the disabled community. In 1984, cognizant of the need to encourage private sector involvement in support of arts for citizens with disabilities, Very Special Arts began a reorganized effort. The goals of that reorganization, signaled by the name change from NCAH to VSA, were threefold: to increase private sector support of Very Special Arts programs; to insure the long-term existence of

Very Special Arts programs at state and local levels; and to establish a national network of state-level organizations committed to expanding opportuntities for disabled individuals to participate in the arts. To realize those goals, a number of significant changes were implemented. Each state was asked to establish an independent, not-for-profit organization called Very Special Arts (state name) with broad-based citizen support from the education, arts, business and volunteer communities. State Very Special Arts organizations were then required to develop a long-range plan for resourcing and extending their program services throughout the state in order to be eligible for the vital funding which Very Special Arts receives from Congress and passes through to state organizations.[1]

A new graphic identity was developed to complement the name change and then adopted by each Very Special Arts organization. A new national program initiative called Special Projects was developed to insure that VSA participants were provided year-round opportunities to engage in structured experiences in each art form. Thus, a dance program, entitled New Visions, was developed in concert with the Alvin Ailey American Dance Theatre to bring dance initially to people who are blind and now to individuals with a wide variety of handicapping conditions. A theatre program, called the Henry Fonda Young Playwrights Project, now in its third year, was initiated to introduce disabled and non-disabled students to the dramatic arts and culminates each year with the production of an original play at Kennedy Center. To promote participation in yet another discipline, VSA has launched a Creative Writing Project in cooperation with PEN to encourage people with disabilities to explore opportunities for creativity and self-expression through poetry. All of these Special Projects are designed to open new avenues for participation in the arts to individuals with disabilities. Like the Very Special Arts Festival, which remains the cornerstone of our efforts, each program emphasizes ability rather than disability, and each program focuses on the capabilities, accomplishments and special talents of Very Special Arts participants. In so doing, we believe these programs not only provide the disabled community with valuable educational experiences, but also help to heighten public awareness about the important contribution disabled individuals can make to society, not only in the arts but in other vitally important areas.

Because of the generous support of Congress, Very Special Arts' reorganization plan has ushered in a two-year period of unprecedented growth and expansion. Thirty-nine states and the District of Columbia have formed not-for-profit Very Special Arts organizations designed to provide statewide program opportunities to their disabled citizens. The remaining 11 states have plans to incorporate this year. Two hundred and forty-nine Special Projects sites will introduce individuals with disabilities to dance, drama, creative writing, music and the visual arts in communities throughout the country. And the on-going efforts of artists, educators, parents and volunteers will culminate in 700 Very Special Arts Festivals which will take place in all 50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico this year alone. An examination of 1987 state Very Special Arts budgets reveals that the vital seed money grants provided through Congressional authorization and appropriations to VSA have resulted in a five-to-one match from other funding sources at the state level. In the interest of brevity, these facts are provided to offer only a brief glimpse of the benefits and accomplishments which derive from the interest and support which Congress has provided over the last three years.

The continued assistance and support of Congress over the next three years, which we now seek through this testimony, will enable Very Special Arts to face future challenges occasioned by our recent growth and to meet the growing needs of the field within the confines of limited financial resources. Additionally, we would be most appreciative if additional resources could be provided to VSA to assist us in meeting the evergrowing needs of the field.

Organizationally, increased training and technical assistance must be provided to VSA state organizations so that they can effectively expand and extend their programs to meet the needs of the disabled individuals in their state. Among our priorities for the next three years will be the implementation of new and expanded information and resource systems, including the following: the establishment of a national data bank in which research documents, publications and bibliographies, artists directories and related information can be stored; the development of teacher and artist training institutes; the coordination of a parent advocacy network; the establishment of an expanded media access system for talented artists and individuals with disabilities; the initiation of a cooperative project for promising disabled artists designed to enhance their employment capabilities; the creation of a national disabled artists registry; and the provision of expanded training and technical assistance to emerging state VSA organizations to increase their effectiveness in a wide variety of areas.

---

[1] At the present time, VSA allocates approximately one-third of its Congressional funding to direct state grants with another third earmarked for new program initiatives, national demonstration programs and training and technical assistance services.

Previous reauthorizations have enabled us to achieve our early goals, and we ask that this subcommittee grant us again an extension of our authorization so that we may reach our new objectives.

Very Special Arts is proud and honored to submit this testimony and to be considered by the subcommittee for reauthorization as we look forward to a promising future for special arts.

○